Expanded Community Advisory Panel (XCAP)

THIS PACKET INCLUDES:

A compilation of emails (public comments, etc) submitted to the XCAP email box, XCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org, between **September 16 and September 23, 2020 at 12:00 pm approximately**.

Note: This PDF contains bookmarks separating each email in this compilation. If you'd like to see the bookmarks but your internet browser doesn't show them, download this PDF from your browser, then re-open it in a PDF reader (such as Adobe Reader, Foxit, etc) and make sure your bookmarks panel is open.

From:	Sandy Rosenberg
To:	Expanded Community Advisory Panel
Subject:	Charleston/Meadow rail options
Date:	Wednesday, September 16, 2020 3:31:23 PM

The worst option possible for the Rail crossing at Charleston and Meadow is a berm. The berm in Belmont has, in effect, cut the City apart -berm is ugly and divisive. Our preferred method would be the Underpass option. Thank ou for allowing our input.
Sandra and Richard Rosenberg
Wilkie Way

From: David Kennedy
To: Expanded Community Advisory Panel
Subject: Churchill Ave RR Crossing
Date: Wednesday, September 16, 2020 7:40:40 PM

Just a few comments following up on today's meeting (9/16/2020) as I had already spoken re Churchill Ave and according to the established procedure could not speak again.

Has any thought been given to a bike/ped **overcrossing** at Churchill over both Alma and the Caltrain tracks rather than a bike/ped underpass? Or are overcrossings less preferred by the bicycle coalition? The costs, flatter ramp slopes, space and configuration required at entrances/exits might be better (and therefore less impact on the residences on Churchill), aesthetics for users and constructability might be more favorable than an Option 2 underpass and its impacts.

I did not hear any discussion about the bike/ped underpass being built on one side or the other of Churchill, rather in the middle of the street. Would there less impact on the Churchill residences since it could be built to directly impact only one side of Churchill rather than most of the block? Most likely the 100 block of Churchill will be closed at Alma.

As primarily a pedestrian rather than a bicyclist I personally feel in a dangerous situation when using an underpass that is also used by bicyclists. Many bicyclists are careful and considerate but there are others, and it only takes one. Accordingly, as part of the design the passageway should be made as wide as reasonably feasible for the safety of pedestrians and slower bicyclists.

As part of the conceptual considerations of mitigations for closing Churchill (which will result in the elimnation of the ability for safe (with a traffic light) WB Churchill to SB Alma movements) will one or more traffic lights be installed along Alma so that vehicles from University South, Professorville, Old Palo Alto and most other areas east of Alma can safely access SB Alma? Please note that unless some traffic lights are installed there will be no safe SB access to Alma from much of the eastern portion of Palo Alto between Homer Ave to Meadow Rd! Also please note, installing some traffic light configurations only at Embarcadero and Alma and Oregon and Alma will only cuase more people to try to use areas that will already be gridlocked at different times during the day.

Thank you for your consideration.

David Kennedy

From:	Bob March
To:	Expanded Community Advisory Panel
Cc:	Karen Brannon; hadouglas@yahoo.com; Chris Ouk; Karen Ouk; Martin, Lety Liberman
Subject:	Comment on Charleston Road underpass concept
Date:	Wednesday, September 16, 2020 5:27:19 PM

Dear XCAP members:

I'm commenting on the proposed underpass solution for the Charleston Road / Alma / Caltrain intersection.

I own a home in the project's immediate area, at 153 Lundy Lane. According to the visualizations I've seen, the City would need to acquire a small strip along the back boundary of my property and that of several neighbors in order to allow changes to be made to the east side of Alma between Ely and Charleston. That's the standpoint from which I'll be posing these few questions and comments.

1. I understand that the various proposed projects all have the laudable goals of improving overall safety and preventing the severe impacts on traffic on Charleston that were expected to result from Caltrain's plans to increase the number and length of trains after their electrification project is completed. My question is: *Are Caltrain's plans still the same, or are they having second thoughts because of a decline in ridership resulting from current and future pandemic-related restrictions?* I've read that their business plan is in flux for that reason. Should we not wait a bit longer and see whether the anticipated impacts on traffic flow are mitigated, or even delayed by several years, because of curtailed railway use?
2. The shifting of Alma's boundary on its eastern (northbound) side, with its requirements to acquire property, is caused partly by a new northbound right-turn-only lane carrying Alma traffic onto eastbound Charleston. I recognize that such lanes are generally desirable, but given the impact on nearby properties, *how sure are we that adding the lane here is really justified by the future traffic loads that we anticipate? How many hours per day do we think that Alma traffic will be heavy enough that the lane will actually bring a commensurate benefit to traffic flow?*
3. On the western (southbound) side of Alma, the underpass plan features a ramp permitting eastbound Charleston traffic to turn right and ascend from the Charleston level to the Alma level. This is the other factor that shifts the eastern edge of Alma further to the east, impacting my property and that of my neighbors. The visualizations seem to show the ramp's right curb running right along the edge of the railroad right-of-way. *As an alternative, is there any prospect that the railroad would allow that ramp to be built **within** the adjacent boundary of their right-of-way, either by purchase or some other arrangement?* If so, the ramp wouldn't have the effect of pushing the eastern boundary of Alma further east.
4. Utility poles are currently located on the city-owned planted strip on the east side of Alma between Ely and Charleston. With the underpass concept, that land seems to be devoted to the planned right-turn-only lane, so the poles would have to be moved. Would they be moved onto my remaining property and those of my neighbors? Or would they perhaps be placed in the strip of land which the City would acquire?

Thanks for your attention, and for the good work you have already done.

Sincerely,

Bob March
153 Lundy Lane
Palo Alto
415-412-2132

From: lprice@vcn.bc.ca
To: Expanded Community Advisory Panel
Subject: Grade separation at Churchill and at Charleston/Meadow
Date: Wednesday, September 16, 2020 1:32:10 PM

I speak as a cyclist who uses the intersections at Churchill, Charleston and Meadow regularly.

My strong preference would be for a trench: it's the easiest and most pleasant to navigate by bike and also by neighborhood cars.

Raised rails (viaduct and hybrid) disperse the sound further into the neighborhoods. They leave an ugly "dead" space underneath them that feels unsafe and unpleasant for cyclists. I don't like them.

An underpass suffers some of the unpleasantness of a viaduct and would cause me to search for alternate routes. (I use Charleston and Churchill to avoid the underpasses at San Antonio Station and at University Ave.) It would need to be quite wide to accommodate the morning high-school rush of ~20 cyclists per light. And it would make it harder for cars to access Alma.

These intersections are heavily used by high school students biking to school. Please consider the cyclists' perspective in making your recommendation.

Thank you,

Lottie Price
Charleston Meadows

From:	khurshid gandhi
To:	Expanded Community Advisory Panel; Transportation; Council, City
Subject:	Grade Separation comments Sept2020
Date:	Wednesday, September 16, 2020 4:39:14 PM

Hello,

I live in the Charleston – Meadows neighborhood and I would like to bring up a few points and my preferences for the imminent grade separation happening in Palo Alto

<!--[if !supportLists]-->1. <!--[endif]--> Over two years ago, the Charleston-Meadows neighborhood submitted a petition signed by almost 600 individuals stating their preference for an underground option for the trains. I urge you to consider that petition and know that that the preference still holds good. Now that the tunnel has been ruled out, we would like to see the trench alternative move forward. You can also find the petition here **https://drive.google.com/file/d/1klcrioBxfiCyueO2F-ECz-TlfpJH-ihe/view?usp=sharing**. Also, relatively recently San Gabriel constructed a trench. I would urge that the costs be looked at closely to make sure that the estimated costs presented to the citizens of Palo Alto are realistic and justifiable. https://www.theaceproject.org/san-gabriel-trench-grade-separation

<!--[if !supportLists]-->2. <!--[endif]-->My personal preference -- only if a trench were absolutely impossible -- would be an option satisfies the following:

(a) keep the roads at grade level: While many options provide under and over passes for bike/peds, that is not optimal. Even a 20 ft wide lane to be shared by peds, children, bikers, wheelchairs, strollers and double strollers, joggers, older folks using walkers or lugging along wheeled crates would not be enough area. Any level of a grade to these bike/ped makes it more unfriendly for the younger and older bike/ped users. Having a grade has many problems: Difficulty for bike/peds (specially at either end of the age spectrum), cars and traffic accelerating on the downward grade, line of sight obstruction which always makes the area a bit more unsafe, pooling of water during heavy rains and many more.

(b) No necessity of eminent domain. We love our neighbors and neighborhood and don't want anyone to be compelled to either have a decrease in house value or to move out.

(c) All turning intersections at Meadows and Charleston **have to be accessible** by traffic as well as bikes/peds. This is extremely important to maintain connectivity in the neighborhood and to prevent traffic from being funneled into neighborhood side streets.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->3. <!--[endif]-->I am opposed to the underpass and hybrid options due to the above. I feel like the underpass is the worst offender due to the comments in #2 above. Also, to someone holding a hammer, every problem looks like a nail. I hope that is not the case with AECOM and hybrids. While AECOM has a lot of experience building hybrids in the bay area, and they be most comfortable with building hybrids, I do not think that the hybrid is the best solution for Charleston-Meadows.

Thank you for your attention and consideration of this matter.

Sincerely

Khurshid Gandhi

From: Jeff Wolfeld
To: Expanded Community Advisory Panel
Subject: Grade separation for Charleston
Date: Wednesday, September 16, 2020 12:52:36 PM

Please:

No elevated train.
No viaduct.
No hybrid.
No elevated tracks.

I am willing to have a small rise in the tracks, but not enough to make the train visible from behind the houses lining that side of Park.

Sincerely,
Jeff Wolfeld
272 Whitclem

From: Alan Lee
To: Expanded Community Advisory Panel
Subject: Grade separations at Charleston/Meadow
Date: Wednesday, September 16, 2020 1:59:35 PM

Dear XCAP,

Thank you for your work on considering the grade separations in Palo Alto. As a resident of Charleston Meadows I am writing to speak out against the elevated rail options (Hybrid and Viaduct).

The AECOM drawings of the Hybrid and Viaduct tell us that the steel Caltrain electrical poles will sit 45 to 50 feet above the roadway, and the wires will suspend between them. After seeing the 50 or so top-heavy poles being constructed these past few months, they are not nearly as light as depicted in the AECOM drawings. These are large green steel columns, not light white poles. Whatever the appearance, this infrastructure will tower over the adjacent residences. It will be four times higher than the single-story overlay residences in my neighborhood. Sitting far above the abutting residences, the Hybrid/Viaduct and the Caltrain poles will be visible at great distances. This hasn't been captured in the AECOM renderings, but is now easy to visualize by driving along Alma and imagining what doubling the height of the Caltrain poles would look like.

The potential increases in the distance that the train noise will travel is also concerning. While the AECOM noise study tells us that the noise at the first and second row of houses is fairly similar for all four options (Table 5-3), what is not quantified in the report is the effect on houses beyond the first 150 ft (first two rows). The report acknowledges that "[The Viaduct and Hybrid] may create some increased noise level beyond first row for diesel freight events." Houses beyond the second row (150 ft), will also see increased noise as "second row homes to both the east and west receive some acoustical shielding by the first row of homes." The increases for noise are important, as [1] notes "over the 20th century… noise sensitivity increased substantially. The case for constructing underground as opposed to elevated rail lines is therefore stronger today than a century ago." I worry that the AECOM study did not accurately capture the noise that would spill over a large portion of South Palo Alto were the Hybrid/Viaduct built.

Like the cities of Boston, New York and Chicago, I believe we will regret any elevated rail decision almost immediately. In Boston's case, they built it, regretted it, and spent 80 years getting rid of it. I think any construction of a Hybrid/Viaduct is a mistake and would be a burden for future Palo Altans.

Sincerely,

Alan Lee

[1] Ahlfeldt, Gabriel M., Volker Nitsch, and Nicolai Wendland. "Ease vs. noise: On the conflicting effects of transportation infrastructure." (2016).
https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/147312/1/cesifo1_wp6058.pdf

From:	YORIKO KISHIMOTO
To:	Expanded Community Advisory Panel; Council, City
Subject:	Problems with Churchill closing traffic analysis
Date:	Wednesday, September 16, 2020 12:59:32 PM
Attachments:	Memo-Churchill Avenue At-Grade-Xing.pdf

Dear Chair Naik and XCAP members (and Honorable City Council):

We commissioned Dr. Michelle DeRobertis, P.E. a licensed traffic and civil engineer to review the traffic report that is the basis for your decision on the proposed Churchill closing.

The impact of closing the Churchill at-grade crossing on the following aspects of the road system **have notable omissions** in the August 2020 and November 2019 traffic studies. They include:

1. Analysis of capacity of Embarcadero Road underpass. "This is not to suggest that the Embarcadero underpass should be widened.. , but only to state that when comparing the pros and cons and the financial implications of all the options, the cost of widening the Embarcadero under crossing (and Alma bridge) may need to be included in the cost of the "Churchill closure" scenario to compare to the cost of the "Churchill grade separation" scenario and the cost of the "Churchill partial underpass".

2. Future traffic volumes were for the year 2030. However, 2030 is only ten years out. Often, future traffic analyses use a future horizon year of 20 to 25 years in the future, especially for projects that are expected to be in place for decades, as this would be.

3. The traffic study analysis of the diverted trips impacts was restricted only to impacts on automobile travel and only at intersections. Automobile level of service (LOS) at intersections is not the only element of the roadway system that could be impacted by capacity constraints.

4. The report did not address the intersection level of service (LOS) and operating conditions at the new signalized intersection of Embarcadero Road/Kingsley Avenue. This should be addressed both for automobiles, pedestrians and bicyclists.

5. Proposed designs are likely to be found not able to be "fixed" by mitigation. "If this project were to be pursued, many design details would need to be worked out with regard to maintaining access to existing residential driveways on Embarcadero Road, Kingsley Street (sic), High Street, and the Embarcadero slip ramp" More clarity on what exactly the impacts would be, if these design details cannot be worked out, would be appropriate before an alternative is selected. The traffic study does not mention that **it is likely that these impacts of the mitigation itself cannot be mitigated and that the solution to avoid these impacts is to preserve a Churchill roadway crossing**.

6. Impact on emergency vehicle and transit travel time.

There are six pages of comments, attached for your review.

Finally, we attach here a link to an excellent article on the flaw of trying to shoe-horn in ped/bike access only after proposed auto operations have been designed. The bike/ped infrastructure are foundational to the quality of life in Palo Alto and should be designed as a priority, not after thought. https://cityobservatory.org/the-myth-of-pedestrian-infrastructure-in-a-world-of-cars/

Thank you,

Yoriko Kishimoto
Rob Levitsky

John Hackmann
Rachel and Thomas Kellerman
Michael Chacon
others

Memo

September 15, 2020

To: **Yoriko Kishimoto**

From: **Michelle DeRobertis, P.E.**

Subject: **Churchill At-grade Xing Traffic Analysis**

This memorandum presents comments and observations on the traffic studies of the impact of closing the Churchill Avenue, Palo Alto at-grade railroad crossing and the proposed mitigation. I have reviewed the August 13, 2020 memo from Hexagon which also contains the November 26, 2019 traffic study, also by Hexagon. The latter refers to a TJKM traffic study, which I did not review.

These comments take into account the forthcoming Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) guidance on conducting multimodal traffic studies[1]. ITE recognizes that a major shortcoming of many traffic impact analyses is that they often neglect to analyze the impact of roadway changes and/or land developments on other roadway users besides automobiles. The new ITE recommended practice is that traffic studies should address not only impacts on automobile traffic but also impacts to transit service, pedestrians, bicyclists, and sensitive areas such as residential streets. Thus, the following comments reflect the need to evaluate traffic impacts on all modes, including transit travel time, pedestrian and bicyclist circulation and sensitive areas such as residential streets, not only auto level of service.

REVIEW OF TRAFFIC STUDIES

The August 13, 2020 study of the closure of the Churchill Avenue at-grade crossing describes the following as the options:

- Do Nothing- maintaining the existing at-grade option.
- Complete closure of the Churchill Avenue roadway rail crossing while maintaining pedestrian and bicyclist access by the construction of a nonmotorized undercrossing.
- The partial underpass of Churchill Avenue; this would create a Tee intersection at Alma Street with Churchill Avenue access to and from the west, as shown in Figures 3A and 3B of the August 2020 study.
- Proving a grade-separated roadway crossing. The study identified this option as a viaduct, an elevated structure for the railroad. (Presumably other reports addressed other alternatives of providing grade separation including a roadway undercrossing of the railway, or by undergrounding the railroad).

[1] ITE Recommended Practice - *Multimodal Transportation Impact Studies*, expected publication in 2020.

1834 Casterline Road
Oakland CA 94602
m.derobertispe.@gmail.com
MMD. .. ..

It is recognized that the "Do Nothing" alternative (retaining the existing at-grade roadway crossing) is not feasible given the proposed increase train frequencies. Thus one of the other options above must be chosen. The costs associated with these options and their associated mitigations and other necessary new infrastructure were not presented in the traffic study and are not the subject of this review.

This review focusses on the analysis of the impacts of the complete closure option as presented in the November 2019 traffic study. The study addressed the traffic diversion from the intersection of Churchill Avenue at Alma Street to Embarcadero Road due to closure of the existing at-grade crossing of Churchill Avenue. This memorandum presents comments in these main areas:

- Assignment of the diverted trips
- Future analysis year
- Assessment of impacts of the diverted trips
- Mitigations measures and analysis of the impact of the mitigation measures

1. Assignment of the Diverted Trips

The traffic study evaluated how and where existing Churchill Avenue traffic would divert to other routes to cross the railroad. While the traffic volumes were not described in terms of vehicles per day, based on the turning movement volumes, it appears that approximately 7,000 vpd use the Churchill at-grade crossing, 5,000 of which are to and from Alma Street and 2,000 proceed east on Churchill Avenue.

The impacts of these diverted automobile trips away from the intersection of Churchill Avenue at Alma Street was the basis for assessing the impacts of the closure of Churchill at-grade crossing. The traffic study identifies the existing AM and PM peak hour turning movements, and Figures 7A and 7B depict the path that the diverted traffic is predicted to use. The traffic study then analyzes the impacts of the diversion of these auto trips. For simplicity, this discussion will refer to the AM peak hour volume, unless noted.

<u>Figure 7A Eastbound movements</u>

- Eastbound right turn movement from Churchill onto southbound Alma Street (150 trips): the majority was assigned to Oregon Expressway. This seems like a reasonable assumption.

- Eastbound left turn from Churchill onto northbound Alma Street (89 trips): It unclear where this movement was assigned. Figure 7A shows that 89 AM trips as being assigned to an eastbound left turn at the intersection of Embarcadero and Alma, but this left turn is not possible. The way to make this movement (turn from eastbound to northbound) is to enter the Embarcadero Road underpass heading east and then use the slip ramp to Kingsley Avenue as a loop onramp onto Alma Street. Thus these additional trips (89 AM and 127 PM or about 1000 vehicles per day) would use the section of Kingsley Avenue heading westbound and then would turn right onto Alma Street.

1834 Casterline Road
Oakland CA 94602 m.derobertispe@gmail.com

Figure 7B Westbound Movements

- Southbound right turn from Alma Street onto westbound Churchill (157 AM): this movement was assigned to Lincoln -Emerson via a left turn from Alma Street onto Lincoln Avenue to access Embarcadero Road. This was then mitigated by assigning them to turn left onto Kingsley Avenue to access Embarcadero Road.

- Northbound left turn from Alma to westbound on Churchill (199 AM): 97 of the 199 AM (and 94 of the 190 PM peak hour trips) appear to be diverted to turn left at Oregon Expressway. This seems to be a reasonable assumption. It is unclear where the remaining ~100 vehicles per hour (vph) were assigned during both the AM and PM peak hour. It appears as if some if not all of the remaining 100 vph would be diverted to the Lincoln Avenue -Emerson Street route to access Embarcadero Road to head west. The report states:

> "Traffic from Alma Street that wants to head west on Embarcadero Road must use Lincoln Avenue to Emerson Street. The amount of traffic going "around the block" to access Embarcadero from Alma would increase by 157 vehicles during the AM peak hour and 97 vehicles during the PM peak hour."

Thus, it does not appear that any of the northbound left-turn movement was assumed to divert to this route. If the 100 extra trips from the northbound left-turn movement were assumed to divert to this route also, then the projected diverted volume would be 157 + 100 = 256 AM peak hour trips, and about 97 + 100 = 194 PM peak hour trips. This is about 2000 vehicle per day (vpd) that would use the Lincoln-Emerson route or the alternate route recommended as mitigation.

2. Future Analysis Year

Impacts of the closure of the Churchill Avenue at-grade crossing were assessed by comparing existing conditions with two scenarios: existing volumes with the closure and future volumes with the closure. Future traffic volumes were for the year 2030. However, 2030 is only ten years out. Often, future traffic analyses use a future horizon year of 20 to 25 years in the future, especially for projects that are expected to be in place for decades, as this would be. A 2013 City of Palo Alto Memo (ID # 4327) titled "Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines and Traffic Model Update"[2] cited the year 2035 as the future analysis year, which at the time was 20+ years in the future.

3. Assessing the Impacts of the Diverted Trips

The Hexagon November 2019 Traffic Study stated that 24 intersections were evaluated by a prior TJKM traffic study and that the TJKM study determined that the closure of the Churchill Avenue railroad crossing would create significant impacts at eight study intersections. Hexagon disagreed with two of the impacts, but agreed with impacts six intersections. Thus the Hexagon report proceeded to discuss

[2] Department of Planning &Community Environment available at https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/38140

the six intersections for which it also recommended mitigations. (Comments on these mitigations are discussed in the next section).

The traffic study analysis of the diverted trips impacts was restricted only to impacts on automobile travel and only at intersections. Automobile level of service (LOS) at intersections is not the only element of the roadway system that could be impacted by capacity constraints or other problems due to increased traffic. In addition, increased traffic also impacts other modes and sensitive areas. These are discussed further below.

Impacts on other roadway elements

The impact of closing the Churchill at-grade crossing on the following aspects of the road system do not appear to have been evaluated in the August 2020 and November 2019 traffic studies.

1. The Embarcadero Road underpass. The volumes for this location were not presented for any of the three scenarios: existing conditions, existing volumes with Churchill closure, and future year with Churchill closure. In order to assess the full impact of the Churchill closure on automobiles, the following should be analyzed for the Embarcadero Road underpass under all three scenarios: the average daily traffic volume (ADT), the AM peak hour volumes, and PM peak hour volumes. Furthermore, as stated above, 2030 is not typical future scenario; the future year should be 2040 or beyond. This is not to suggest that the Embarcadero underpass should be widened, but only to state that when comparing the pros and cons and the financial implications of all the options, the cost of widening the Embarcadero undercrossing may need to be included in the cost of the "Churchill closure" scenario to compare to the cost of the "Churchill grade separation" scenario and the cost of the "Churchill partial underpass".

2. At the unsignalized intersections, the LOS of the impacted turning movements were not presented. The LOS for the unsignalized intersections was presented with the note "Average delay is reported for the worst approach at one-way stop intersections. LOS F is not substandard unless a signal warrant is met". However the specific movement or movements experiencing LOS F were not identified nor was the increased delay or increased queue length associated with that movement, for example for the left turn from Alma Street onto Lincoln Avenue. For three unsignalized locations, the recommended mitigation was a traffic signal, so perhaps this was why no further analysis was presented.

Impact of increased traffic on other modes and sensitive areas

1. Impact on bus travel times due to increased traffic on Embarcadero Road was not assessed. Concentrating more traffic on fewer roadways adversely impacts public transit because buses are limited to using these fewer roadways which now carry more auto traffic.

2. Similarly concentrating traffic onto fewer roadways increases the impact to pedestrians and cyclists who use those roadways. The impact on Bicycle LOS or level of traffic stress due to additional automobile traffic on Embarcadero Road was not assessed. The impact on bicycling and pedestrian conditions on Embarcadero Road should be assessed at two locations: west of Alma Street and east of Alma Street.

1834 Casterline Road
Oakland CA 94602 m.derobertispe@gmail.com

3. Impacts of the closure of the Churchill at-grade crossing and the increased traffic on Embarcadero Road underpass on emergency vehicle response time was not addressed.

4. Impacts of increased traffic on pedestrian delay and bicycle delay at signalized intersections was not assessed.

5. Residential streets. The traffic studies did not address the adverse impact of the diverted traffic on Lincoln-Emerson residential streets, only stating that this route was "circuitous" for vehicular traffic. It is implied that this "circuitousness" is the reason for the recommended mitigation. The traffic study did not address the adverse impacts of the additional traffic on the residents of these streets. It instead recommended an alternative to the use of Lincoln Avenue and Emerson Street which involves the use of another residential street—Kingsley Avenue. This impact on Kingsley Avenue was not stated nor evaluated. The impact of additional traffic on residential roadways is not due to capacity but due to livability and safety concerns.

4 Mitigation and Impacts of the Proposed Mitigation

The November 2019 traffic study states that six intersections would have significant impacts but that they could be mitigated. The main mitigation affecting Embarcadero Road and its environs is to encourage diverted traffic to turn onto Kingsley Avenue to access Embarcadero Road westbound instead of using the Lincoln-Emerson route to access Embarcadero Road westbound. Other diverted trips onto Kingsley are the eastbound trips that wish to head north on Alma Street.

The report analyzed the intersections affected by the traffic diversions and developed mitigation measures. However, mitigation measures themselves can have impacts. The impacts of the following proposed mitigation were not evaluated:

- The study proposed three new traffic signals, at the intersections of Alma Street/ Embarcadero slip ramp; Alma Street/Kingsley Avenue; and Embarcadero Road /Kingsley Avenue. While the report evaluated the intersection level of service (LOS) of the first two intersections with signal operation, it did so only for automobiles. The LOS experienced by pedestrians and bicycles was not evaluated.

- The report did not address the intersection level of service (LOS) and operating conditions at the new signalized intersection of Embarcadero Road/Kingsley Avenue. This should be addressed both for automobiles, pedestrians and bicyclists.

- This impact of the new signalized intersection at Embarcadero Road at Kingsley Avenue on transit travel times on Embarcadero Road was not assessed. The impact of the two new signalized intersections on Alma Street on transit travel times was also not addressed. Note this is in addition to the impact on transit travel time of the increased traffic on Embarcadero Road discussed above.

- The traffic study did not address the fact that Kingsley Avenue is a residential street with single family home frontage. There would be additional north and southbound traffic on Kingsley Avenue. The resulting queue of traffic waiting to turn left onto Embarcadero Road at new signal at Embarcadero Road/ Kingsley Avenue and the westbound traffic turning right onto Alma Street from Kingsley Avenue

1834 Casterline Road
Oakland CA 94602 m.derobertispe@gmail.com

would impact the existing residents. The annoyance factors of noise and pollution were not addressed nor was the length and duration of each queue.

- The report states the following with respect to the recommend mitigation to route diverted traffic from Lincoln-Emerson to Kingsley Avenue:

> "If this project were to be pursued, many design details would need to be worked out with regard to maintaining access to existing residential driveways on Embarcadero Road, Kingsley Street (sic), High Street, and the Embarcadero slip ramp"

More clarity on what exactly the impacts would be, if these design details cannot be worked out, would be appropriate before an alternative is selected. The traffic study does not mention that it is likely that these impacts of the mitigation itself cannot be mitigated and that the solution to avoid these impacts is to preserve a Churchill roadway crossing.

- The traffic study states that at the intersection of El Camino Real & Embarcadero Road "significant traffic impacts would occur due to reassigned traffic." It then recommended additional turning lanes (a westbound left-turn lane and a northbound right-turn lane) along with "signal optimization". The impacts of these "improvements" on pedestrians and bicyclists were not evaluated nor was signal optimization. Signal optimization often means longer signal cycle lengths. While it is true that models show this can reduce the average delay experienced by motorists, they also show that longer signal cycles almost always increase the delay experienced by pedestrians and bicyclists. One could argue that pedestrians and bicyclists are disproportionately impacted by the wait at long signal cycles. The impact of these mitigation measures, both the turning lanes and the signal changes, on pedestrians and cyclists should be evaluated.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The August 2020 and November 2019 traffic studies on the impacts of the closure of the Churchill Avenue at-grade rail crossing focussed solely on automobile operations. In the evaluation of the diversion of auto trips that would occur if Churchill at-grade crossing were closed, there was no analysis of the impact of additional auto traffic on the other users of Embarcadero Road e.g., on transit service, emergency vehicles, bicyclists and pedestrians. Furthermore, the future analysis year, ten years in the future, is not consistent with a typical planning horizon year of 20 years. There was no evaluation of the impact on the residential streets. Lastly there was no analysis of the impacts of the mitigation measure themselves, particularly on pedestrians, bicyclists, and residential streets. The study states that "many design details would need to be worked out". Many questions remain with respect to the impacts of the closure of Churchill Avenue at-grade crossing, and further analysis would be appropriate before a decision is made with respect to this alternative. Alternatively, the solution to avoid these impacts is to preserve a Churchill roadway crossing.

The following issues were not addressed in the November 2019 or August 2020 traffic studies.

1. The traffic studies did not address how the increased traffic and traffic congestion on Embarcadero Road will affect the following:

- Public transit travel time on Embarcadero Road and Alma Street
- Emergency vehicle response time in the Embarcadero Road and Churchill Avenue corridors.
- Bicycle LOS or bicycle level of traffic stress on Embarcadero Road
- Bicycle or pedestrian delay at existing signalized and unsignalized intersections.
- Impact of new signals on public transit travel time, on both Alma Street and Embarcadero Road and on pedestrians and bicycle LOS
- Impact to pedestrians and bicyclists of proposed mitigation measures at the signalized intersection Embarcadero Road and El Camino Road (additional turn lanes and "signal optimization").

2. There was no assessment of capacity of the Embarcadero Road underpass under current and future conditions. If it is at or near capacity now or in the future year scenario, it would be appropriate to consider the cost of widening the Embarcadero undercrossing in the cost of the "Churchill closure" scenario, (for example when comparing the cost of the "Churchill grade separation" scenario to the Churchill closure scenario).

3. The future analysis year is 2030. 2030 is only ten years out, while often traffic analyses use a future year of 20 to 25 years in the future. This is especially appropriate for projects that are expected to be in place for decades. This could have implications when assessing whether or not the Embarcadero Road underpass is sufficient to accommodate diverted traffic from Churchill.

4. It appears that the analysis did not account for all the traffic that would divert to Kingsley Avenue. The study only specifically identifies the 157 AM peak hour trips that formerly were turning right from Alma onto Churchill (and the corresponding PM peak hour trips) that would divert to Kingsley if the proposed new signals were provided. But there appears to be another 100 AM peak hour trips that were turning left from Alma onto Churchill that are unaccounted for. There is also the 89 left turns (AM peak hour) and 127 left turns (PM Peak hour) currently eastbound on Churchill turning left onto Alma Street that would use the slip ramp onto Kingsley Avenue to go northbound on Alma Street.

5. The traffic study did not address impacts on residential streets due to the diversion of auto trips from Churchill Avenue. Mitigation for the circuitous route of using Lincoln-Emerson was to direct this traffic to use Kingsley Avenue. The traffic study did not address the issue that residential streets have different considerations beyond "capacity". It did not describe the magnitude of the impact of the additional traffic on Kingsley Avenue, such as describing the existing traffic volumes and the future volumes with traffic diversion. The mere presence of more cars in a public space or residential street changes the ambience of a location, and this is a quality beyond which is measurable by traffic capacity

1834 Casterline Road
Oakland CA 94602 m.derobertispe@gmail.com

and safety metrics. This was recognized over 50 years ago by Colin Buchanan in *Traffic In Town*[3]*s* and will be addressed in the forthcoming ITE Recommended Practice *Multimodal Traffic Impact Studies*.

It is likely that an analysis of these issues would find significant and unavoidable impacts. The solution would be to choose a different alternative such as a grade separation or partial underpass at Churchill Avenue. A partial underpass would have much fewer impacts since approximately 5,000 vpd to and from the west would not be diverted to Embarcadero Road. The partial underpass retains a T - intersection at Churchill Avenue and Alma Street, thus all movements to and from the west of Alma Street could remain on Churchill Avenue and would not use Embarcadero Road. The August 2020 report did not fully evaluate the route of the traffic that would still be diverted with a partial underpass, but it would be much less than under full closure alternative.

Full roadway grade separation would retain the most accessibility not only for cars but also for transit, emergency vehicles, bicyclists and pedestrians, in both corridors. There would be no traffic diversion to Embarcadero Road and thus there would be no diversion to either Lincoln-Emerson or Kingsley Avenue to access Alma Street.

The way to avoid the adverse impacts of both the diversion caused by the closure and the proposed mitigation measures themselves is to preserve roadway access across the railroad tracks at Churchill Avenue. This could be accomplished by several design options including: (a) providing a partial underpass, i.e., maintaining a T intersection at Alma and Churchill, as shown in Figure3A and 3b of August 2020 study; (b) providing a roadway grade separation such as the viaduct; (c) providing a roadway grade separation by undergrounding the railroad and maintaining level street crossings for automobiles, bicyclists and pedestrians; or (d) a hybrid option such as partial undergrounding the railroad combined with a roadway overcrossing. The latter would reduce rail noise, visual impacts and may reduce other impacts, compared to the viaduct option.

[3] [3] Buchanan, Colin. 1963. *Traffic in Towns: A Study of the Long Term Problems of Traffic in Urban Areas.* London: Her majesty's stationery office.

From: Guo, Weiqing
To: Expanded Community Advisory Panel
Subject: Rail Input for Charleston and Meadow
Date: Wednesday, September 16, 2020 5:49:09 PM

To the rail panel members:

I'm resident on Park Blvd and have been following the high-speed rail project. Considering the impact of this project on the community and residents living close to the rail, I would strongly request that the panel will consider the trench (Rail lowered under the road) as the 1st option and underpass as the 2nd option. Other options (Viaduck and Hybrid) would severely and adversely impact the local community and local residents.

Thank you!

Weiqing Guo

4042 Park Blvd.

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From:	Parag Patkar
To:	Expanded Community Advisory Panel
Subject:	South Palo Alto Grade Separation Petition from 2018
Date:	Wednesday, September 16, 2020 7:37:30 PM
Attachments:	SOUTH PA PETITION RAIL SEPARATION@MEADOW_CHARLESTON Final.pdf Signatures on the S PA petition from 2018.pdf

Dear XCAP team members
First of all, I personally couldn't thank all of you enough for all your hard work over these past few years.

I also wanted to bring to your attention the petition some of had started in 2018 that listed out all the things we strongly felt regarding the South Palo Alto intersections.

That petition now has 594 signatures.

I am attaching that petition to this email. I am also listing out the names and addresses of all the signees.

I really hope you would take this feedback into account.

With kind regards,

Parag

Parag Patkar
4117 Park Blvd

SOUTH PALO ALTO PETITION - RAIL PROJECT @ MEADOW / CHARLESTON

We, as residents of South Palo Alto and the greater Palo Alto community want to clearly communicate our preferences to the Palo Alto City Council in the matter of the upcoming rail upgrades.

We strongly feel that the Palo Alto City Council consider the following points:

- We adamantly **oppose EMINENT DOMAIN** and seek to minimize property losses for our neighbors.
- We **oppose road OVERPASS options** for the Charleston/Meadow crossings in all circumstances.
- We **oppose RAISED RAIL OPTIONS** such as those involving berms or viaducts.
- We **support LOWERED RAIL OPTIONS** such as those involving a tunnel or trench.
- We **support INCREASED SAFETY** for all residents of our community, and especially for students, cyclists, and pedestrians.

What we require from the Palo Alto City council:

- Comprehensive information, analysis, and clearer communication easily accessible and available to us on the costs, property loss, and traffic impacts of a
    - Meadow/Charleston trench (with/without freight train considerations)
    - Meadow/Charleston tunnel (with/without freight train considerations)
    - Meadow/Charleston road-under-rail hybrid
- Alternative financing options
- Inclusion of official community stakeholder involvement and representation

Dated: 5/5/2018

Signature Count	Full Name	Address
1	stephen gaudio	278 Monroe Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94040
2	Jett Richards	#17, 278 Monroe Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94040
3	Shan Richards	#17, 278 Monroe Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94040
4	DIANA COLLINS	#35, 278 Monroe Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94040
5	Jason Matlof	118 Churchill Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94301
6	David Shen	128 Churchill Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94301
7	payvand kadivar	1454 Hamilton ave, Palo Alto, CA 94301
8	Christine Czarnecki	614 Marion Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94301
9	Sarada Chigurupati	1131 Parkinson Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94301
10	Barbara Carter	2545 Webster Street, Palo Alto, CA 94301
11	Katherine Lose'	724 Coastland Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94303
12	Jawahar Chiguruapti	818 East Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94303
13	Kathy Lierle	970 Ecsinore Court, Palo Alto, CA 94303
14	Nancy Hogan	814 Garland Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94303
15	Sunita Sarin	3161 Greer Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
16	Davina Brown	3525 Greer Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
17	Betsy Dickie	190 Heather Lane, Palo Alto, CA 94303
18	Roberta Stone	737 Loma Verde Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94303
19	Anne Fillin	2890 Ross Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
20	Sunita Verma	3495 Ross Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
21	Carol MacDonell	3649 Ross Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
22	Dulce Ponceleon	3770 Ross Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
23	Walter Murray	3770 Ross Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
24	Barbara Jaarsma	3335 Stockton Place, Palo Alto, CA 94303
25	Jucquelya Caierea	3313 Vernon Terrace, Palo Alto, CA 94303
26	Daksha Dave	349 Walter Hays Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94303
27	Lori McCormick	764 Cereza Dr, Palo Alto, CA 94306
28	Niels Smaby	4230 Ruthelma Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94306
29	Rubert Meggwra	4032 2nd Street, Palo Alto, CA 94306
30	Neel Valame	4039 2nd Street, Palo Alto, CA 94306
31	Raj Valame	4039 2nd Street, Palo Alto, CA 94306
32	C. Schwerer	4059 2nd Street, Palo Alto, CA 94306
33	Carmela Ciral	4065 2nd Street, Palo Alto, CA 94306
34	Cary Shants	4071 2nd Street, Palo Alto, CA 94306
35	Engenne Kim	4079 2nd Street, Palo Alto, CA 94306
36	Wesky Lin	4082 2nd Street, Palo Alto, CA 94306
37	Daniel Lilienstein	4050 Manzana Lane, Palo Alto, CA 94306
38	Candice Wheeler	4134 Abel Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94306
39	Heewon Park	455 Alder Lane, Palo Alto, CA 94306
40	Hongxia Xiong	430 Alger Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
41	Marie Anne Fogel	441 Alger Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
42	Kathleen Goldfein	3163 Alma Street, Palo Alto, CA 94306
43	Kathleen Goldfein	3163 Alma Street, Palo Alto, CA 94306
44	Dawne Hom	3483 Alma Village Circle, Palo Alto, CA 94306
45	Ivan Hom	3483 Alma Village Circle, Palo Alto, CA 94306

46	Rachael Cox	437 Amarillo Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
47	Marta Rostriguey	574 Arastradero Road, Palo Alto, CA 94306
48	Gaya Bhaskar	580 Arastradero Road, Palo Alto, CA 94306
49	Lakshmi Muralidharan	580 Arastradero Road, Palo Alto, CA 94306
50	Elaine Aeal	609 Arastradero Road, Palo Alto, CA 94306
51	Christy Rice	670 Ashton Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
52	Matt Passell	315 Barclay Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
53	Sandra Koppe	315 Barclay Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
54	Dennis Brown	325 Barclay Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
55	Faith Brown-Rate	325 Barclay Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
56	Jake Brown	325 Barclay Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
57	KC Keith	4023 Ben Lomond, Palo Alto, CA 94306
58	Laurie Levy	810 Bruca Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
59	Paul Seaver	3638 Bryant Street, Palo Alto, CA 94306
60	Jean-marc mommessin	3726 Carlson Circle, Palo Alto, CA 94306
61	Tim Perkins	3712 Carlson Circle , Palo Alto, CA 94306
62	Hing Sham	241 Carolina Lane, Palo Alto, CA 94306
63	Choi Lee	241 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
64	Kevin Moore	251 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
65	Xiaohua Liu	252 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
66	Mattison Lutini	271 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
67	Jane Xue	281 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
68	Ester Chiachio	282 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
69	Oscar Redondo	282 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
70	Bob Adle	291 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
71	Lowt Lakye	291 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
72	Amie Neff	292 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
73	Douglas Eck	292 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
74	Trene Mata	327 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
75	Claire Fiennes	341 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
76	Hugo Fiennes	341 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
77	Neera Sohoni	342 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
78	Venkat Sohoni	342 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
79	kathleen murren	351 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
80	Edith Carrick	361 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
81	Lee Hsiand	362 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
82	Pauline Tran	362 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
83	Michael Wu	371 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
84	Ying On	371 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
85	Eva Shen	422 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
86	Jack Liu	422 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
87	Anne Hessing	431 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
88	Min Chung	442 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
89	Chikako Shigmatsu	462 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
90	Stephen Shigematsu	462 Carolina Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
91	Mark Segato	1225 Carson Street, Palo Alto, CA 94306
92	Brian McCormick	764 Cereza Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306

93	Lori McCormick	764 Cereza Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
94	Nisha Datta	797 Cereza Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
95	Susan Burnett	Christopher ct, Palo Alto, CA 94306
96	Ana Funes	1133 Colorado Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94306
97	Anne Schmtt	2344 Columbia Street, Palo Alto, CA 94306
98	Karen Schreiber	183 Creekside Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
99	Harry Maklee	4206 Darlington Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
100	Cristiana Costa	4212 Darlington Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
101	Curis May	4212 Darlington Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
102	Xiangqim Hu	4216 Darlington Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
103	Yi Zheng	4216 Darlington Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
104	I Purse	4224 Darlington Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
105	Youxiang Wang	4236 Darlington Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
106	Zhengqi Li	4236 Darlington Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
107	Anna Wang	4240 Darlington Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
108	Kevin Wang	4240 Darlington Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
109	A Fiedzienly	4265 Darlington Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
110	MB McGrath	4265 Darlington Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
111	S. Fiedzivsko	4268 Darlington Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
112	Roxanne Patel	230 Davenport Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
113	Han Chen	250 Davenport Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
114	Lillian Arajon	255 Davenport Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
115	Diwret Lou McCourt	270 Davenport Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
116	Jean Wang	271 Davenport Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
117	Xun Liu	290 Davenport Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
118	Ying Zhang	290 Davenport Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
119	Rebacca Marasco	307 Diablo Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
120	Mary Shaw	363 Diablo Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
121	Aleqeksandr Shvets	431 Dinahs Ct, Palo Alto, CA 94306
122	Jean Qiu	110 East Charleston Rd, Palo Alto, CA 94306
123	Ying Fong	110 East Charleston Rd, Palo Alto, CA 94306
124	Michael Wessel	272 East Charleston Rd, Palo Alto, CA 94306
125	Patrice Banal	272 East Charleston Rd, Palo Alto, CA 94306
126	Karen Kalinsky	210 East Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
127	Mark Talbott	229 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
128	Michelle Djolic	229 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
129	Nicolas Talbott	229 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
130	Anne Littleboy	234 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
131	John Littleboy	234 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
132	Brian Cooper	237 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
133	Andrea Moore	250 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
134	Angela Feng	255 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
135	James Young	255 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
136	Becky Epstein	256 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
137	Keith Reckdahl	256 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
138	Craig Evans	257 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
139	Diana Luberman	257 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306

140	Carol Bly	261 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
141	Jim Bly	261 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
142	Krista McDermott	291 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
143	Kyung Jung	295 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
144	Yoon Jung	295 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
145	Shachi Bahl	297 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
146	Keri Wagner	311 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
147	Trevor Jones	311 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
148	Lucy Baldwin	330 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
149	Anakarid Salles	361 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
150	Jaime Ross	380 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
151	Lindsay Zosmo	381 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
152	Joanna Jiao	390 Edlee Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
153	Sergei Lopatin	#12, 4173 El Camino Real, Palo Alto, CA 94306
154	Elizabeth Cowie	189 El Dorado Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94306
155	Jim Cowie	189 El Dorado Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94306
156	Ashish Patwardhan	316 El Verano Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94306
157	Sonia Patwardhan	316 El Verano Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94306
158	Karen Brannon	193 Ely Place, Palo Alto, CA 94306
159	Samir Mittal	271 Ely Place, Palo Alto, CA 94306
160	Ana Barabas	340 Ely Place, Palo Alto, CA 94306
161	Nicholas Hall	3089 Emerson St., Palo Alto, CA 94306
162	Rinat Beeri	742 Encina Grande Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
163	Sophie Ravel	275 Fernando ave, Palo Alto, CA 94306
164	Nikki Narang	281 Fernando Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94306
165	Suman Kasturia	253 Ferne Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94306
166	Franklin Shifrin	3120 Flowers Lane, Palo Alto, CA 94306
167	Calvin Chen	419 Gene Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
168	Jaya Pandey	580 Georgia Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94306
169	Jayendu Jayendu	580 Georgia Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94306
170	Crystal Botham	610 Georgia Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94306
171	Peir Wen Xu	660 Glenbrook Dr., Palo Alto, CA 94306
172	LYNDA HEIDEN	122 Greenmeadow Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
173	Valerie Stinson	151 Greenmeadow Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
174	Chris Proia	111 Greenmeadow Way , Palo Alto, CA 94306
175	Shesleara Ballopos	2809 Greer Road, Palo Alto, CA 94306
176	Anamari Eng	4167 Hubbartt Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
177	Ceabi Senguta	2820 Illinios Street, Palo Alto, CA 94306
178	Johanna Sunden	730 Josina Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94306
179	Marius Milner	3513 Julie Ct, Palo Alto, CA 94306
180	Casie Walker	550 Kelly Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
181	Manjusree Bose	528 Kendall Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94306
182	Katie O'Conner	772 Kendall Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94306
183	Prerana Vaidya	3533 La Mata Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
184	Peter Streiff	3723 Lindero Dr, Palo Alto, CA 94306
185	Rich Kimble	787 Los Robles Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
186	Ali Vand	826 Los Robles Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306

187	Jessica Vand	826 Los Robles Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
188	T.R. Ranganath	363 Maclane St, Palo Alto, CA 94306
189	Vasui Dhir	393 Maclane St, Palo Alto, CA 94306
190	Lucy Wu	395 Maclane St, Palo Alto, CA 94306
191	Cindy Kao	201 Maclane Street, Palo Alto, CA 94306
192	Cheryl Basden	3889 Magnolia Dr, Palo Alto, CA 94306
193	Christine Stafford	625 Matadero Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
194	Susanne Wisen	411 Maureen Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94306
195	John Pan	3874 Mumford pl, Palo Alto, CA 94306
196	Dan Fortune	3962 Nelson court, Palo Alto, CA 94306
197	Daniel Fortune	3962 Nelson Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306
198	Alan LEE	4252 Newberry court, Palo Alto, CA 94306
199	Zoe Peters	4242 Newberry Ct, Palo Alto, CA 94306
200	Daniela Kuehu	4248 Newberry Ct, Palo Alto, CA 94306
201	Michael Kuehu	4248 Newberry Ct, Palo Alto, CA 94306
202	Alan Lee	4252 Newberry Ct, Palo Alto, CA 94306
203	Maria Shuth	4254 Newberry Ct, Palo Alto, CA 94306
204	Tor Ravbenheime	4262 Newberry Ct, Palo Alto, CA 94306
205	Mukul Agarwal	4266 Newberry Ct, Palo Alto, CA 94306
206	Lorrin Lewis	920 Paradise Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
207	Karen Ceresnak	4114 Park blvd, Palo Alto, CA 94306
208	Lindsay Joye	3793 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
209	Constance Stillinger	4055 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
210	David Jeong	4056 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
211	Gwen Jeong	4056 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
212	Scott Hemenway	4101 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
213	FLAVIU TUREAN	4104 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
214	JANAKI Ramachandran	4104 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
215	Pradeep Solanki	4105 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
216	Swati Solanki	4105 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
217	Svetlana Yepanechnikova	4107 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
218	Yurily Tepanechnikova	4107 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
219	Jeff Marcacci	4109 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
220	Lisa Marcacci	4109 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
221	John Hofer	4111 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
222	Renee Hofer	4111 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
223	Antonia Wang	4113 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
224	Ilya Vergman	4113 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
225	Karen Cenesnak	4114 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
226	Scott Cenesnak	4114 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
227	Richard Lee	4115 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
228	Nagini Chilukuri	4117 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
229	Parag Patkar	4117 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
230	Joelle Zom	4118 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
231	Maxim Stepana	4118 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
232	Anjan Ghose	4119 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
233	Wendy Ghose	4119 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306

234	Jeanne Hamrick	4121 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
235	Jonathan Marion	4121 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
236	Sarah Marion	4121 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
237	Robert Martison	4123 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
238	Stephanie Martinson	4123 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
239	Marilyn J Edwardson	4126 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
240	Ashalata Karmarkar	4127 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
241	Vish Karmarkar	4127 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
242	David Lui	4129 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
243	Linda Lui	4129 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
244	LETHA DiLauro	4131 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
245	Anupama Kumar	4133 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
246	Apurb Kumar	4133 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
247	David Herzl	4135 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
248	Deborah Waxman	4166 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
249	Susan Gray	4173 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
250	Logan Hanson	4176 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
251	Gary Forman	4180 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
252	Aareev Panda	4183 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
253	Arun Panda	4183 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
254	Sumita Debata	4183 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
255	Min-yi Shen	4195 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
256	Anupam Bordia	4201 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
257	Surbhi Bordia	4201 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
258	Irene Lloyd	4203 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
259	Wilma Milligan	4207 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
260	Phil Egan	4217 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
261	Beverly Rodriges	4241 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
262	Muir Hooper	4241 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
263	Carolyn Horne	4249 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
264	Jonathan Horne	4249 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
265	Lee Langhammer	4253 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
266	Wing Law	4253 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
267	Christina Lee	4269 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
268	Kwok Law	4269 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
269	Saxon Noh	4273 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
270	Virginia Noh	4273 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
271	Jayaraman Vasudevan	4277 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
272	Vanaja Narayanaswamy	4277 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
273	Phil Douglas	4285 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
274	Tracy Douglas	4285 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
275	Ivy Li	4293 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
276	Kenneth Li	4293 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
277	Yumei Sun	4293 Park Boulevard, Palo Alto, CA 94306
278	Chaks Chigurupati	1131 Parkinson Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94306
279	Janine Hodgson	170 Parkside Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
280	John Wiese	208 Parkside Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306

281	Joseph Doniach	290 Parkside Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
282	Shira Yair	4257 Pomona Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94306
283	Amber Chang	4282 Pouce Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
284	Kathleen T. Chen	3066 Price Ct., Palo Alto, CA 94306
285	Len Filppu	3621 Ramona Circle, Palo Alto, CA 94306
286	Pahson Korahon	#526, 845 Ramona St., Palo Alto, CA 94306
287	Ashwinee Khaladkar	3716 Redwood Cir, Palo Alto, CA 94306
288	Bhushan Khaladkar	3716 Redwood Cir, Palo Alto, CA 94306
289	krys corbett	3786 Redwood Circle, Palo Alto, CA 94306
290	Paul Ramsbottom	3796 Redwood Circle, Palo Alto, CA 94306
291	Alex Woo	3720 Redwood Circle , Palo Alto, CA 94306
292	Kristinn Gudjenssa	4248 Rickeys Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
293	James Silver	45 Roosevelt Circle, Palo Alto, CA 94306
294	Henry Yu	46 Roosevelt Circle, Palo Alto, CA 94306
295	Cynthia Patrick	54 Roosevelt Circle, Palo Alto, CA 94306
296	Susan Phinney Silver	45 Roosevelt Circle , Palo Alto, CA 94306
297	Vijay Varma	3254 Ross Road, Palo Alto, CA 94306
298	Niels Smaby	4230 Ruthelma Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94306
299	Tina Phi	4235 Ruthelma Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
300	Yoel Crane	4235 Ruthelma Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
301	Elsie Wu	4247 Ruthelma Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
302	Seth Wu	4247 Ruthelma Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
303	Carmina Luce	4255 Ruthelma Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
304	Henry Luce	4255 Ruthelma Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
305	Hossam Bahlool	4256 Ruthelma Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
306	Rime Sand	4256 Ruthelma Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
307	Sedgid Oklander	4260 Ruthelma Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
308	Hari Iyer	4261 Ruthelma Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
309	Parvati Iyer	4261 Ruthelma Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
310	Sheralyn Listgarten	4075 Scripps Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94306
311	Byron Young	250 Scripps Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306
312	Randy Butera	3195 South Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306
313	Bonny Parke	3292 South Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306
314	Suzanne Jacobs	3345 South Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306
315	Susan Iannucci	3540 South Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306
316	Carol Kuner	3617 South Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306
317	Xiaofang Zhu	3652 South Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306
318	Laura Clausen	3359 St. Michael Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306
319	ramarao digumarthi	575 Starr King Circle, Palo Alto, CA 94306
320	dov lantsman	3707 Starr King Circle, Palo Alto, CA 94306
321	Kari Hodgson	3707 Starr King Circle, Palo Alto, CA 94306
322	Arancha Rodriquez	570 Suzanne Ct, Palo Alto, CA 94306
323	Anna Wichansky	4234 Suzanne Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
324	Nicholas Filipp	4234 Suzanne Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
325	Amelia Tung	4240 Suzanne Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
326	Gongwen Huang	4248 Suzanne Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
327	Xiuzhen Zhong	4248 Suzanne Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306

328	Jinyong Han	1116 Taheo Ln., Palo Alto, CA 94306
329	Katie Wies	274 Tennessee Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
330	Edwin Fox	294 Tennessee Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
331	Carlos Feder	433 Tennessee Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
332	Jacqueline Feder	433 Tennessee Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
333	Allison Kin	434 Tennessee Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
334	Kathy Davis	443 Tennessee Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
335	Florence LaRivere	453 Tennessee Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
336	Ginny LaViviera	453 Tennessee Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
337	Bina Shah	3483 Thomas Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
338	Anat Gur	315 Victoria Pl, Palo Alto, CA 94306
339	Nadav Gur	315 Victoria Pl, Palo Alto, CA 94306
340	Sishi Long	325 Victoria Pl, Palo Alto, CA 94306
341	Wei Xiao	325 Victoria Pl, Palo Alto, CA 94306
342	Ellen Harfog	330 Victoria Pl, Palo Alto, CA 94306
343	Cynthia Costell	3518 Waverley Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
344	Mayra Gonzalos	1830 West Bayshore Road, Palo Alto, CA 94306
345	Tranj Ngugen	2460 West Bayshore Road, Palo Alto, CA 94306
346	Dina Saari	280 West Charleston Road, Palo Alto, CA 94306
347	Assim Gupta	350 West Charleston Road, Palo Alto, CA 94306
348	Ratnadeep Bhattacharjee	365 West Charleston Road, Palo Alto, CA 94306
349	Tim Gadus	150 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
350	Leila Vand	225 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
351	Reza Vand	225 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
352	Kapil Chhabra	281 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
353	Swati Chopra	281 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
354	Evelyn Aguon	315 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
355	Nicolas Aguon	315 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
356	Randy Aguon	315 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
357	Taylor Aguon	315 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
358	Ann Chen	319 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
359	Anthony Ching	319 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
360	Khurshid Gandhi	321 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
361	Khushroo Gandhi	321 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
362	Francisco Wei	330 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
363	Dipti Borkar	350 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
364	Mandar Borkar	350 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
365	Win Naina	370 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
366	Olge Gellenbage	425 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
367	Coleen Lorenz	432 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
368	Suzuki	451 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
369	Susie Robbins	459 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
370	Mary Sheng	461 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
371	Eric Stietzel	239 Whitclem Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306
372	Lynne Shietzel	239 Whitclem Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306
373	David Ephron	259 Whitclem Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306
374	Lara Ephron	259 Whitclem Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306

375	Claire Smith	215 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
376	Glenn Smith	215 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
377	Syed Rizvi	225 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
378	Josh Maltz	228 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
379	Carlin Otto	231 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
380	D Petillo	248 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
381	Kirtee Raparia	248 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
382	Yong Lee	254 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
383	Jeff Wolfeld	272 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
384	Jennifer Wolfeld	272 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
385	Andreea Manolache	273 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
386	Silvia Manolache	273 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
387	Khosrow Moslehi	282 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
388	Maryam Mossadeghia	282 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
389	Son Nguyen	292 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
390	David Xue	301 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
391	Yan Li	301 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
392	Jieun Shin	302 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
393	Sang-Min Lee	302 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
394	Bernard Heng	312 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
395	Mary Lee	312 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
396	Patty Fewer	321 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
397	Corine Cesana	324 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
398	Joseph Cesana	324 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
399	Deborah Sharb	331 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
400	Annie Hempstead	344 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
401	James Hempsteuce	344 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
402	Ann Garr	353 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
403	Rex Garr	353 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
404	Kimiko Sanami	354 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
405	Joan Jennings	369 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
406	Steve Jennings	369 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
407	Deborah Shaoub-Ju	371 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
408	Werner Jr	371 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
409	Rene Ho	374 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
410	R. Gillespie	384 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
411	Tanya Do	386 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
412	Jan Moeller	393 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
413	Don Marquant	398 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
414	Jaime Shpall	1429 Wilkie Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306
415	Yiashua Zhang	4030 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
416	Mona He	4040 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
417	Ziming Weng	4073 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
418	James Porter	4080 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
419	Michael Moorhead	4084 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
420	Mona He	4090 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
421	william moss	4091 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306

422	Jagdish Pamnani	4100 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
423	Leena Joshi	4102 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
424	Nirav Chhatrapati	4102 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
425	Jennifer Lee	4103 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
426	Keith Lee	4107 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
427	Rita Lee	4107 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
428	Ryan Lee	4107 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
429	Jenny Wang	4115 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
430	Jonathan Zhang	4115 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
431	Jagdish Pamani	4123 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
432	Floreue Keller	4124 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
433	Amor Terrazas	4133 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
434	Leslie Donahue	4134 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
435	Joan Holtzman	4139 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
436	Deepa Cuere	4154 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
437	Jagannath Dubashi	4154 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
438	Magda V. Grant	4155 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
439	Philip Smaller	4155 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
440	Justin Branue	4161 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
441	Ann M. Robinson	4164 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
442	Alex Ross	4175 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
443	Richard Rosenberg	4211 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
444	Jatians Tchoub	4256 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
445	Dhinja Karthik	4264 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
446	Lama Rimawi	4124 Willmar Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
447	Nancy & Herve Vanclef	3750 Wright Place, Palo Alto, CA 94306
448	Susan McConnell	3775 Wright Place, Palo Alto, CA 94306
449	Nicole Young	4210 Ynigo Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
450	Martin W. Molloy, Ph.D	3566 South Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306-4222
451	Jonathan Luk	114 Monroe Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
452	Son Nguyen	292 Whitclem Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
453	Janaki Ramachandran	4104 Park blvd, Palo Alto, CA 94306
454	Linda Jensen	241 Colorado Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94301
455	Debra Wittenbrink	2757 Waverley Street, Palo Alto, CA 94306
456	Yidong Tong	3661 Ramona Cir, Palo Alto, CA 94306
457	Ting Jiang	3661 Ramona Cir, Palo Alto, CA 94306
458	Lin Zhang	3644 Ramona Cir, Palo Alto, CA 94306
459	Li Feng	72 Roosevelt cir, Palo Alto, CA 94306
460	Will Xie	70 Roosevelt cir, Palo Alto, CA 94306
461	qing he	751 seminole way, Palo Alto, CA 94303
462	Carol Chatfield	86 Roosevelt Circle, Palo Alto, CA 94306
463	Marilyn Bauriedel	3673 South Ct, Palo Alto, CA 94306
464	William Bauriedel	3673 South Ct, Palo Alto, CA 94306
465	lei lin	764 Clara drive, Palo Alto, CA 94303
466	Nicola Chriss	282 Carolina Lane, Palo Alto, CA 94306
467	Lianying Duan	122 Ely Pl, Palo Alto, CA 94306
468	Deyu Hu	109 Ely place, Palo Alto, CA 95306

469	Jennifer Ramberg	151 Ely Place, Palo Alto, CA 94306
470	Abraham Shacham	3826 mumford Place, Palo Alto, CA 94306
471	Paula Collins	110 110 Ely Place, Palo Alto, CA 94306
472	David Collins	110 110 Ely PL, Palo Alto, CA 94306
473	Karen Ouk	129 Lundy Ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
474	Christopher Ouk	129 Lundy Lane, Palo Alto, CA 94306
475	Douglas Ha	137 Lundy Lane, Palo Alto, CA 94306
476	Sarah Nguyen	137 Lundy Lane, Palo Alto, CA 94306
477	Vanessa You	3142 Flowers ln, Palo Alto, CA 94306
478	Scilly Wang	4218 McKellar ln. , Palo Alto, CA 94306
479	Lina Qiu	440 Maureen, Palo Alto, CA 94306
480	Zhen Xue	645 Maybell, Palo Alto, CA 94306
481	Jennie Chan	4069 Wilkie way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
482	Shirley Wang	427 Ventura Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94306
483	Bruce Chen	4118 Sutherland Dr, Palo Alto, CA 94303
484	Jihong Fang	3416 Cowper st., Palo Alto, CA 94306
485	Graham Rodwell	3946 Nelson Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
486	Lisa Lawrence	153 Lundy Lane, Palo Alto, CA 94306
487	Mike Li	866 Colorado ave, Palo Alto, CA 94303
488	Robert March	153 Lundy Lane, Palo Alto, CA 94306
489	Erica Brand	2642 Ramona St., Palo Alto, CA 94306-2314
490	Elizabeth Dong	3560 Bryant street, Palo Alto, CA 94306
491	Pearlin Yang	432 Margarita Avenue , Palo Alto, CA 94306
492	Hongmin Lu	3425 Rambow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
493	Yi Zhang	3496 Cowper St, Palo Alto, CA 94306
494	Mercia Zheng	866 Colorado Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94303
495	Jinghong Liu	181 El Verano Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94306
496	Kai Zhu	3425 Rambow Dr., Palo Alto, CA 94306
497	Miriam Brown	415 Fernando Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94306
498	Jonathan Brown	415 Fernando Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94306
499	Charlotta Hauksdottir	3645 Ramona Circle, Palo Alto, CA 94306
500	Jing Mu	3490 Rambow Dr., Palo Alto, CA 94306
501	Yang Wang	3490 Rambow Dr., Palo Alto, CA 94306
502	Jenny Kuan	2888 Ramona St, Palo Alto, CA 94306
503	Yao Lu	3140 Emerson, Palo Alto, CA 94306
504	Carl Wiseman	359 Creekside Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
505	Rita Wiseman	359 Creekside Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
506	Srdjan Petrovic	4014 Ben Lomond Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
507	Edith Lin	3934 Duncan Place, Palo Alto, CA 94306-4550
508	shantha Mohan	261 Parkside drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
509	Lionel Vedrine	3639 Bryant street, Palo Alto, CA CA 94306
510	Michel Frei	236 Scripps Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306
511	Thi-Hong-Ha Vuong	236 Scripps Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306
512	Rebecca Marasco	307 Diablo ct, Palo Alto, CA 94306
513	Jerry Dischler	425 Ferne Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94306
514	Geeta Chaudhry	4014 Ben Lomond Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
515	Michal Sadoff	431 Adobe Place, Palo Alto, CA 94306

516	Jacqueline Thurston	241 Creekside Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
517	Lawrence Yang	2888 Ramona St, Palo Alto, CA 94306
518	shaina quinn	201 Chestnut Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306
519	Hilary Somers	4148 Briarwood Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
520	Andy Lin	3934 Duncan Place, Palo Alto, CA 94306
521	Martha Sbarbori	4005 Ben Lomond Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
522	John Sbarbori	4005 Ben Lomond Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
523	Doron Simon	344 Tennessee lane, Palo Alto, CA 94306
524	Galit Simon	344 Tennessse lane, Palo Alto, CA 94306
525	Girija Toke	3657 South Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306
526	Xiaoming Chen	567 Alger, Palo Alto, CA 94306
527	jory bell	380 portage ave, Palo Alto, CA 94306
528	Felicia Fahey	135 Greenmeadow Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
529	Ayla Agarwal	147 Greenmeadow Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
530	Francesco De Paolis	163 Greenmeadow Way, Palo Alto, CA 94036
531	Anna Lavinia Dambrosio	163 Greenmeadow Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
532	brian mickel	155 greenmeadow way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
533	Marilyn Douglas	360 Maclane Street, Palo Alto, CA 94306
534	Plato Wang	4268 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
535	Nancy Kukkola	123 Greenmeadow Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
536	Ambika Pajjuri	4202 Ruthelma Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94306
537	Priti Aggarwal	3806 Louis RD, Palo Alto, CA 94303
538	Shirley Woo	259 Matadero Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94306
539	Andrea Temkin	3371 Park Blvd, Palo Alto, CA 94306
540	Rich Nunziante	3896 Louis Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
541	Laurie Winslow	18 Peter Coutts Cir, Palo Alto, CA 94305
542	Sofia Fojas	3371 Park Blvd, Palo Alto, CA 94306
543	Richard Pering	2250 Cornell, Palo Alto, CA 94306
544	Magdalena Cabrera	397 Fernando Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94306
545	Michelle Djokic	229 Edlee Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94306
546	Mark Talbott	229 Edlee Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94306
547	Brendon Vining	289 Matadero Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94306
548	Thomas Longo	3316 Kenneth Dr, Palo Alto, CA 94303
549	Yaron Simler	834 Mesa Ct, Palo Alto, CA 94306
550	Andrew Liou	4097 Park Blvd, Palo Alto, CA 94306
551	Marie Vida	4097 Park Blvd, Palo Alto, CA 94306
552	Annie Bedichek	884 Loma Verde Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94303
553	Ben Tarbell	3718 Grove Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94303
554	Shani Kleinhaus	3870 Corina Way, Palo Alto, CA 94303
555	Arthur Keller	3881 Corina Way, Palo Alto, CA 94303
556	Bambi Lynn Ware	3596 Louis Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
557	Xiaowei Jiang	118 E Charleston Rd, Palo Alto, CA 94306
558	Jiajie Zhu	118 E Charleston Rd, Palo Alto, CA 84306
559	Ann Robinson	4164 Wilkie Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
560	Ritu Upreti	350 West Charleston Rd, Palo Alto, CA 94306
561	Stephanie Mulqueen	31 Roosevelt Circle, Palo Alto, CA 94306
562	Lucinda Brommersma	3507 Park Blvd, Palo Alto, CA 94306

563	Diane Ruch	108 Greenmeadow Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
564	Andrew Kowal	3507 Park Blvd, Palo Alto, CA 94306
565	Terri Shifrin	4041 Middlefield road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
566	Peter Bergsman	108 Greenmeadow Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306
567	Jennifer Cray	3819 Louis Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
568	Franklin Shifrin	3120 Flowers Lane, Palo Alto, CA 94306
569	Edith Lin	3934 Duncan Pl., Palo Alto, CA 94306
570	Andy Lin	3934 Duncan Pl, Palo Alto, CA 94306
571	Todd Bontemps	124 Lundy Lane, Palo Alto, CA 94306
572	LETHA DiLauro	4131 park blvd, Palo Alto, CA 94306
573	Kay Marie Ferguson	4023 Verdosa Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
574	Andrew Ferguson	4023 Verdosa Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
575	Elena Ramirez	3541 Emerson St., Palo Alto, CA 94306
576	Alan Ting	165 Parkside Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
577	Mary Anne Deierlein	318 Parkside Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
578	Deborah Waxman	4166 Park Blvd, Palo Alto, CA 94306
579	Vibhu Mittal	4087 Orme, Palo Alto, CA 94306
580	Robert Chatfield	86 Roosevelt Circle, Palo Alto, CA 94306
581	Jackie Luu	178 Ely Pl, Palo Alto, CA 94306
582	JOHN WIESE	208 PARKSIDE DRIVE, Palo Alto, CA 94306
583	Paul Ko	178 Ely Pl, Palo Alto, CA 94306
584	Helen Whitney	4062 Ben Lomond Dr, Palo Alto, CA 94306
585	Pamela Parke	3357 South Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306
586	Jayne Pearce	3661 Park Blvd, Palo Alto, CA 94306
587	Alexis Hamilton	3364 st. michael drive, Palo Alto, CA 94025
588	Emily Mathews	3410 Park Blvd, Palo Alto, CA 94306
589	Davina Brown	3525 Greer Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
590	Zara Haimo	3740 Ross Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
591	Mandar Borkar	350 West Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94306
592	Anne-Sophie Mommessin	3726 Carlson Circle, Palo Alto, CA 94306
593	Eddie Gornish	3694 South Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306
594	jean-marc mommessin	3726 carlson circle, Palo Alto, CA 94306

From:	Mukul Agarwal
To:	Expanded Community Advisory Panel
Subject:	XCAP Charleston/Meadow
Date:	Wednesday, September 16, 2020 8:08:39 PM

Dear City Council members, Thank you for your public service to the City of Palo Alto.

I live in the neighborhood that will be impacted by your decisions on Charleston/Meadow train intersection. I am closely following the developments for different options. I was not able to join the Zoom meeting today but I know that there is a deliberative approach to gathering facts and proactively taking in community opinion.

An ugly divided city with a train rumbling through the town over residential homes: is that what PA will look like in future?

Taking a step back, it seems to me that an option that divides the city (from one side of Alma to the other), and one that makes it a unsightly place with the erection of viaducts or walls, with train rumbling through the mid town high above, is going to make Palo Alto a less desirable city to live in. What makes Palo Alto a unique community is its cohesiveness, pride for Eichler housing, middle school kids on bikes going to school and feeling independent, and the list goes on.

Any option that will make for a divided and ugly city should be discarded. To me the choice is less about being for or against a growth agenda. Development is bound to happen as new replaces old. For me it is about preserving Palo Alto's residential neighborhoods, which make this place unique and livable. It is my firm belief that both options that raise the train - either hybrid or viaduct - are the makings of a city that will be have uglier neighborhoods; further subdividing the north and south of Palo Alto along east and west Palo Alto. Is that what we want?

Would the trench option not be better in preserving the character and feel of the city and make it more livable? The train hanging in the air whether walls, viaduct, or hybrid, will be jarring for the entire neighborhoods, not just for houses near by, but for even for communities stretching up-to miles. Consulting firms don't live in the neighborhoods and are incentivised to peddle what they have done in the past.

I will try my best to keep elevating the message for aspects that have no voice - residential neighborhoods and kids, and pedestrians and bikers that go from one side of Alma to the other - so that these are not handed the short end of the stick. For me, the only realy option that would preserve the kid friendly Eicher neighborhood feel with city still as one, is the train in the tunnel option.

I hope you have a great weekend!

Best regards,

Mukul
resident of Palo Alto

From: Adrian Brandt
To: Expanded Community Advisory Panel
Cc: Nadia Naik; Sebastian Petty
Subject: 3rd US “box-jacked” grade sep cuts construction from a year to just weeks
Date: Thursday, September 17, 2020 8:14:22 AM

The pre-cast, box-jack system is only the third of its kind used in the U.S. and reduces construction time from nearly a year to just a few weeks.

Brightline’s track construction pushes train tunnel under Orlando’s Goldenrod Road

https://www.orlandosentinel.com/news/transportation/os-ne-brightline-tunnel-construction-20200917-cj66ylrgafah7dlb6iiuekatye-story.html

From:	Keri Wagner
To:	Expanded Community Advisory Panel; Transportation
Cc:	Keri Wagner
Subject:	Loma Verde/Matadero Creek underpass
Date:	Thursday, September 17, 2020 10:13:05 PM

Dear XCAPers —
Thank you for the time you're putting into the grade separations. And thank you, Nadia, for letting me know that you have spoken with city staff about the Loma Verde/Matadero Creek underpass.

I believe this underpass, which was approved in 2012 and will be the only underpass in South Palo Alto, is a fair mitigation for the construction that will take place on the Meadow and Charleston crossings.

Thank you,
Keri Wagner
311 Edlee Ave

From:	Neil Shea
To:	Expanded Community Advisory Panel
Subject:	Please Think Budget and Pedestrians & Bikes!
Date:	Thursday, September 17, 2020 12:17:29 PM

Huge thanks to the XCAP panel. We know you are getting a lot of repetitive input, we'll be brief:

1. **If you recommend expensive options, please also include (rank) less expensive choices. Money is a factor**. We should not have spent this past year going through this process only to be gridlocked with recommendations that the city may not be able to afford.

2. **Please prioritize Pedestrians and Bikes** (and Strollers/Wheelchairs) in your planning. **Do not** promote choices that **push active transportation users down into tunnels without daylight, less than fully safe, smelling of urine, requiring big climbs up and down**. Make our city friendly and welcoming for people who are not choosing to use cars for every trip.

3. **Write your report with some rigor**. Rank options. Give reasoning, data backup, alternate viewpoints. Be balanced and thorough, befitting the time and resources the city has invested in the XCAP process.

4. For the view that "we cannot raise the track no matter what" (although many communities have happily done exactly that), **please help the community to know why**. Besides the strongly held view of immediate neighbors, is it truly in the interest of the city overall to take these options off the table, given their cost-effectiveness and friendliness to pedestrians and bikes?

5. For Trench & Tunnel options, please be rigorous about the ongoing costs and risks of diverting creeks, pumping stations, the many extra approvals required and associated leadtimes, etc. **What is the net present value of the pumping, maintenance, etc. over the next 100 years?**

6. In thinking about our community over the coming generations, the next 50-100 years, **are we so confident that the personal vehicle will occupy such a large priority as it does today?** Given climate change, growth, preferences of younger generations, etc. **might our priorities** both along and across the corridor **shift increasingly to active transportation modes, public transportation, etc.?**

We support closing Churchill with mitigations; and the Hybrid option for South PA. We support safe routes to school, and prioritizing peds & bikes.

We especially support the least cost, most affordable, most financially realistic options possible. (We do not want to see XCAP fail with gold-plated recommendations that cannot be implemented.)

We thank you and look forward to a serious, rigorous, actionable recommendation from the XCAP panel.

Neil Shea & family
800 High Street (x Homer, 1 blk from tracks & the Homer ped/bike crossing)

From:	David Herzl
To:	Expanded Community Advisory Panel
Subject:	RE: Alternatives for Charleston and Meadow - Option 3 Trench
Date:	Thursday, September 17, 2020 8:00:40 AM

09/17/2020

I watched the meeting yesterday – I strongly agree with the community that we do not want raised options.

NO RAISED OPTION AND NO EMINENT DOMAIN.

I have been to many community meetings this is the overwhelming consensus.

There was a petition signed by about 500 residents to this effect.

Please listen to the community.

WE DO NOT WANT NAISED OPTIONS AND NO EMINENT DOMAIN.

I have some other things to say about the Trench option. I think it could be designed with minimum anchors and without removal of resident trees. They could use braces over the top instead of anchors. Towards the ends you would have to use anchors but if the whole Trench is moved more towards Alma, the anchors at the ends would not penetrate the resident yards. Moving the Trench closer to Alma would help out a lot. I think they could design it to minimize the removal of trees in the residents back yards.

The underpass seems to be an ok option, but without any eminent domain.

I still feel that the Trench is the best option.

Thanks.

David Herzl

From: David Herzl <davherzl@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2020 7:20 AM
To: 'xcap@cityofpaloalto.org' <xcap@cityofpaloalto.org>
Cc: 'davherzl@sbcglobal.net' <davherzl@sbcglobal.net>
Subject: Alternatives for Charleston and Meadow - Option 3 Trench

Thank you for taking the time to read my consideration.

I believe the best option is the **Trench.**

I lived in Palo Alto for over 50 years and live between Charleston ad East Meadow on Park Blvd, on the track side.

The selection will affect me directly.

I have been following this decision for many years and have spoke up in previous City Council Meetings and have also attended some community meetings on the alternative, so I am aware of all of the details of each choice.

I first want to remind the council that a while back, over 500 residents signed a petition against eminent domain and raised options. This rules out options 1 and 2, the Viaduct and the Hybrid. I do feel that these are the worst options. Visual and separation of the City is the main reason. I believe also that the noise will effect more residents. Also in all of the meetings that I have been at most of the residents did not want a raised option.

I know that the trench has its issues and feel that the City should make it happen. **I stand with the decision of a Trench**.

Thanks.

David

09/14/2020

The following if a former correspondence:

Wednesday March 4th 4-6pm
I live between Charleston and East Meadow with my back yard on the tracks.
I strongly feel the trench option is the best option and is what a majority of the community wants.
I want to remind that there is a petition that was signed by about 500 residents that they do not want any eminent domain and no raised options. Trench is the only non-raised option.
I believe the Trench option is the best for the criteria of visible appearance, viaduct is the worst.
I stated to the council in the past:
The trench may be a hard option but I believe the best option and the City should put forth the effort to make it the true option.
I still hold to this.
The City should work to overcome two issue brought up before:

1. A design exception of 2% grade
2. Engineering the creeks

AECOM consultants presented some videos of the alternatives, I thank them for doing this, but I felt the trench option was bias. They put the trench in a bad light and the other options such as Arial as a better option. The Trench option had anchors that would eliminate trees in the back yards.
I still feel strong about the trench even if I have to lose a large tree in my back yard, but feel that the

design could be worked on to avoid this. Two options that would help is to:

1. Struts on the top in middle section
2. Move trench more towards Alma

I am going to repeat what I said before:

The trench may be a hard option but I believe the best option and the City should put forth the effort to make it the true option.

Thanks
David Herzl
4135 Park Blvd
03/04/2020

The following is a letter I sent to Councilmember Tanaka:

Dear Councilmember Tanaka,
Thanks for taking your time to listen to me.

Grade separation options for East Meadow and Charleston.
I have been to several community meetings and council meetings and have continued to express my opinion that the **Trench is the best option**.
Early on I met with varies people in the community and it was obvious that most all wanted an option that was not raised. About 500 residents signed a petition in stating that they do not want any eminent domain and no raised options.
The community was sold on the Trench or Tunnel option. At an early meeting the community found out that there were two big issues. 1. A design exception of 2% grade. 2. Engineering of the creeks. I remember at one meeting the response by the Water District "This is a no starter". The City at this time did no action for the 2% grade. So, this option was sold to the community as a great option but is was realistic.
I sent an email to Cory Wolbach concluding **"The trench may be a hard option but I believe the best option and City should put forth effort making it a true option"**
I am happy that the consulting firm AECOM, provided additional analysis of the options and put together some good videos. I felt that they were bias. They put the trench in a bad light, and the other options such as the Arial as a better option. The Trench had all of the trees removed in the yards of residents, and the Arial option had these big green trees blocking the view. I was disappointed that the Trench was not presented in its best ability. I still believe the Trench is the best option, even though a tree will be removed from my yard and all my neighbor's yard.
Can the consulting company take a good look at the design and make it a better option? Ideas for improvement:

1. **Use the existing tracks as the shoefly and build the trench between the shoefly and Alma. This way the ground anchors will not cause neighbors to lose their trees in the yard. Or even make the shoefly on the side closer to the resident. Bottom line is design the trench closer to Alma.**
2. Instead of using ground anchors secure the walls with struts on the top (bars that go on the top)

Make the trench a true option.
2% grade - What is the progress with the 2% grade exception? Has the City had further conversations with Caltrain on how they can meet their needs with the 2% grade exception?

Creeks – Have there been engineering designs that would be acceptable to the Santa Clara County Water District?
This project is a major project that the community of Palo Alto will have to live with. It is important to get the right option, the option that meets what the community wants and the requirements. I have seen the community want no raised options and they have spoken out with a petition.
The Trench may be a hard option but I believe the best option and City should put forth effort making it a true option.
Thanks.
David Herzl
Palo Alto Resident – up to 50 years.
I love Palo Alto

The following is what I presented to a council meeting December of 2018:

Committee, thank you listening to me and the community.
I have been following the decision of grade separation, and have been to several rail committee meetings, and attended the recent community meeting on November 28th.
I urge the committee to eliminate all raised options and add an underground Deep Bore Tunnel as an option.
I have reviewed all the alternatives with an open mind and come to this question "What is best for the community" and I strongly feel from the three options presented the **Trench alternative is the best**.
I felt the trench option was presented with bias at the community meeting and even rated poorly in the evaluation matrix. Viaduct was dressed up with big trees and the Trench was down played with the removal of trees and only bushes. The trench has issues, 2% grade, the creek crossing, delay in construction, highest cost and only bushes. In the evaluation matrix it did not score so well. I took that evaluation matrix and scored myself and got the following scores. Trench scored 43, Hybrid 36, and Viaduct scored 44. The problem with making the decision solely based on scores from an evaluation is that it is not waited and it is not taking in consideration what the community wants.
An important criteria is "What does the community want"
I personally am ok with a delayed construction, removal of trees, and a higher cost if the end product is better and meets the more important criteria of visual and noise reduction. Again I feel the Trench is the best option and note this option would include the removal of a tree in my back yard.
What does the community want?
From what I hear they do not want raised options. About 500 neighbors signed a petition to this effect and all of the neighbors I talk to strongly feel that they do not want the raised options.
I urge the committee to eliminate all raised options and add an underground Deep Bore Tunnel as an option.
Thanks You

The following is what I presented to the council:

I have been a long time Palo Alto Resident. I went to Palo Verde Elementary School, Wilber Middle School, and graduated Palo Alto High. Palo Alto is a great place to live, this is my home, and love

living in Palo Alto.
Palo Alto has always been bicycle friendly, been on top of recycling, invested in trees throughout the city, and a city that is respectful to the citizens.
I have been following the decision of grade separation, have been to several rail committee meetings, and attended the recent community meeting on November 28th.
I have reviewed all the alternatives with an open mind and come to this question "What is best for the community" and I strongly feel the trench alternative is the best.
I reviewed the evaluation matrix and put scores of 1 to 6 for each criteria.
Trench scored 43, Hybrid 36, and Viaduct scored 44. Even though the Viaduct scored the heist by one point, I still believe the best alternative is the Trench. The criteria of noise and vibration/ and visual should be weighted more, and the Trench is the leader in both of these.
Also a criteria of what does the community want should be included. After all it is the community that has to live with the decision. All the feedback that I have listen to from the community is that they do not want the raised options and in fact there are about 500 neighbors signing a petition to this effect.
The city has a big decision to make, I believe they should evaluate all alternatives using criteria, but should look at what criteria is most important to the community, and what does the community want.
I am willing to live with the disruption and duration of construction if the end product is better. I strongly believe the Trench is the best option. The visual impact of the Hybrid and Viaduct are terrible and the Trench I believe has the highest reduction of noise and vibration.

From:	Han Chen
To:	Expanded Community Advisory Panel
Subject:	XCAP grade separation
Date:	Friday, September 18, 2020 8:42:42 AM

Dear Sir/Madam:

I am a resident of Palo Alto, near E Meadow and Charleston road. I vote for alternative 3) Trench (Rail lowered under Charleston/Meadow). sorry that I missed the zoom meeting to make a public comment on Sept 16, 2020.

my contact information is: 250 Davenport Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306,
phone: 650-996-7421

Best regards

Han Chen

From: Gary Lindgren
To: Expanded Community Advisory Panel
Subject: Churchill Again
Date: Saturday, September 19, 2020 2:37:03 PM

Hello XCAP Committee,
I mentioned in a previous e-mail that I thought that closing Churchill to through traffic between Emerson and Alma "was an intriguing idea." But a couple weeks ago Dave brought up a question, "what about the garbage trucks and a moving van." There would be no way for these large vehicles to turn around. I think it's best to keep Churchill open between Emerson and Alma.
Thank you and Take Care,
Gary Lindgren

Gary Lindgren
585 Lincoln Ave
Palo Alto CA 94301

650-326-0655

Check Out Latest Seismometer Reading
@garyelindgren

Listen to Radio Around the World

Be Like Costco... do something in a different way
Don't trust Atoms...they make up everything

A part of good science is to see what everyone else can see but think what no one else has ever said.
The difference between being very smart and very foolish is often very small.
So many problems occur when people fail to be obedient when they are supposed to be obedient, and fail to be creative when they are supposed to be creative.
The secret to doing good research is always to be a little underemployed. You waste years by not being able to waste hours.
It is sometimes easier to make the world a better place than to prove you have made the world a better place.
Amos Tversky

From:	Kellerman, Thomas W.
To:	Council, City
Cc:	Rachel Kellerman; Expanded Community Advisory Panel; Shikada, Ed; Kamhi, Philip
Subject:	City Council Meeting September 21, 2020 - Agenda Item #7
Date:	Saturday, September 19, 2020 2:58:26 PM
Attachments:	Rail - Final Traffic Letter 7_22_20.docx XCAP Letter - September 11 2020.docx

Palo Alto City Council
Palo Alto, California

Dear Honorable Council Members:

We are writing with regard to Agenda item #7 for the City Council meeting scheduled for Monday, September 21, 2020 concerning the update report to be delivered on behalf of the Expanded Community Advisory Panel ("XCAP").

As the Council considers the recommendations of the XCAP with respect to the Churchill Avenue rail crossing and determines the appropriate next steps to be taken by Council, we urge you to postpone any decision on modifications to this crossing until such time as more complete information is available. Attached to this message are two letters that we have previously submitted to Council that describe in more detail the issues and concerns raised by several citizens with respect to this decision. These issues can be briefly summarized as follows:

Too Many Uncertainties

- There are several important factors affecting this crossing that are currently incomplete. The extent of Caltrain's future operations are uncertain and will not be known for some time. In addition, Caltrain is intending to conduct a study of its entire corridor and adopt recommendations, which will have an important impact on the ultimate design decisions to be adopted by the City Council.
- Palo Alto adopted a Comprehensive Plan in 2017 that is specifically intended to guide major strategic planning decisions such as the rail crossing modifications under consideration. The City Council has not conducted any meaningful analysis of the guidelines set forth in the Comprehensive Plan in reaching these conclusions.

Incomplete Mitigation Analysis

- The proposed closure of the Churchill crossing is based in significant part on a conceptual mitigation proposal included in the traffic report prepared by Hexagon. There are several inconsistencies and significant gaps in traffic report that need to be addressed before a determination can be made. Specific issues to be addressed include the following:

- The traffic report solely addresses "Level of Service (LOS)", which only measures the volume of vehicular traffic capable of crossing through an intersection in a set amount of time. This metric does not take into consideration the effect of a traffic design on pedestrian and bicycle safety or on the quality of surrounding residential streets. There are significant pedestrian and Bicycle safety concerns in adjacent streets (such as the Embarcadero bicycle route and underpass) that have not been analyzed or addressed.
- The traffic study did not calculate the current volume of traffic on Embarcadero Road and, accordingly, it is not able to model the traffic patterns and bottlenecks that may be expected once the mitigation plan is implemented.
- The traffic report does not adequately assess the true cost of feasibility of changes to the Embarcadero/ Alma Street bridge that will be required to implement the mitigation proposal.
- The traffic study only considers projected traffic through 2030. By the time a design is constructed and put in service, it will likely be 2027 or 2028 at the earliest, so this planning parameter is clearly inadequate.

Proposal Does Not Fulfil Council Mandate

- In June 2018, the City Council adopted a resolution that requires the Council in connection with the approval of any proposal regarding the Churchill crossing to "implement appropriate actions to minimize redirected traffic onto residential streets in adjacent neighborhoods and commit to adopting appropriate mitigations to address the impacts". The closure proposal does not yet achieve this mandate.

Importance of Equity

- Equity is an important requirement in adopting any proposal. If traffic is to be redirected from one neighborhood to another, it is incumbent on the City Council to ensure that adequate mitigations are implemented and that the burden is shared by all members of the community, not just the residents of a few streets.

The bottom line is that the process to date has been conducted in an isolated and short-term focused manner. The decisions before the Council are fundamental long-term planning issues that will affect the design and livability of our City for many decades to come. There has been very little effort to think through these designs in a truly comprehensive way. The decision to postpone any discussion of a Downtown Plan and the Palo Alto Avenue crossing until after making these decisions is shortsighted in the extreme. It is obvious to anyone who spends time in the Northern half of Palo Alto that Palo Alto Avenue, Downtown and the Embarcadero corridor are a highly-integrated community of vehicular traffic, bicycle and pedestrian activity, and residential, retail and commercial use. Moreover, decisions are being proposed without obtaining meaningful input from several impacted neighborhoods, the adjacent commercial interests (including both Downtown and Town & Country), PAUSD or Stanford. To spend hundreds of millions of dollars to redesign specific arteries

for this portion of the City while ignoring the effect on the rest of the related area would be a poor use of precious funds and will likely result in an unacceptable City design.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues.

Thomas W. Kellerman
Rachel H. Kellerman

1129 Emerson St. | Palo Alto, CA 94301
Mobile: +1.650.283.5023
thomas.kellerman@morganlewis.com
kellermanr@yahoo.com

Thomas W. Kellerman
Rachel H. Kellerman
1129 Emerson Street
Palo Alto, CA 94301

July 22, 2020

Palo Alto Expanded Community
Advisory Panel
250 Hamilton Ave., #7
Palo Alto, CA 94301-2531

Ladies and Gentlemen:

We are writing with respect to the final traffic study delivered to the XCAP, as it relates to the alternatives with respect to the Churchill Ave. rail crossing. Some engaged citizens refer to the Churchill closure/traffic mitigation study as “perfect”, citing improved LOS ratings at various intersections. We respectfully disagree. In fact, one reason we object to the XCAP making any final recommendations for the Churchill crossing at this time is the flawed and confusing traffic study.

For the following reasons we urge XCAP members to withhold endorsing or rejecting any plan for Churchill until a full traffic analysis is completed and vetted by experts involved in city planning and transportation, bicycle and pedestrian advocates, neighbors and neighboring institutions such as schools and businesses, and the community at large.

Lack of Community Engagement

Even before the onset of the pandemic, the traffic study process lacked robust community engagement. Now that prospect is even more daunting.

Our neighborhood asked for and never received direct engagement between community members and city staff with the various traffic consultants. This type of interaction would have provided an opportunity to understand the assumptions underlying the study and provided direct “on-the-ground” input to the consultants to help inform their conclusions.

In addition, the bicycle community was never formally engaged in the mitigation evaluation process, and the views of Palo Alto High School students, staff and administrators were not included in the proposals regarding changes to this major artery to school. This lack of neighborhood engagement has led to confusion and frustration, and diminished the value of the conclusions expressed in the report.

Apparent Flaws in the Traffic Study

There are several areas where the current traffic study appears to be flawed or at least incomplete. For example, the current report describes mitigations that are different from the graphics linked to the mitigation text. Graphics 8A and 8B do not show the left-hand turn lane or light at the corner of the Embarcadero slip road and Alma, yet this mitigation is described on page 17 bullet point two. The consultants considered two designs for the Embarcadero/ Kingsley/ High Street area, but the report seems to be uncertain as to which design is being proposed. The two designs could have significantly different impacts on traffic flow and safety. Similarly, the projected traffic counts do not correspond with the anticipated changes. For example, the projected traffic flow indicates a decrease in the number of vehicles traveling through the Alma/ Kingsley intersection after the mitigation when in fact the point of the mitigation is to direct additional traffic to that intersection.

Limited Focus on LOS (Cars) Ignores Bicycle and Pedestrians North of Embarcadero & Does Not Follow Comprehensive Plan

The traffic study only looks at car traffic (LOS) and ignores the impacts to the very busy school/community bicycle and pedestrian route that runs along the north side of Embarcadero. This route is an official Palo Alto bicycle route, but it is not reflected in the conceptual design. Moreover, the traffic study does not count bicycle and pedestrians along the Embarcadero corridor because they were not asked to do so.[1] Residents did a daily count of bicycles and pedestrians that crossed the busy intersection of Emerson/Kingsley/Embarcadero between 7:30-8:30 am on a typical school day and counted 300 crossings and 100 cars that stopped or “paused “at the stop sign. On that day, they witnessed one near miss when a car did not fully stop causing a student to swerve aside to avoid being hit. Note that if the mitigation to add a left turn onto Alma from the Embarcadero slip road is adopted, the volume of traffic crossing the bike path to enter the slip road will be significantly increased.

[1] https://connectingpaloalto.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Item3-Hexagon-Responses-to-XCAP-Traffic-Questions.pdf Page 6

We recognize it is not the XCAP's job to solve all the bicycle and pedestrian problems in Palo Alto, but we ask that the XCAP recognize that this incomplete mitigation plan has the potential to make an already dangerous bicycle route worse. Traffic mitigation plans for this area should include a Kingsley/Embarcadero bike/pedestrian route that is safe enough to qualify for "safe route to school" designation.

Embarcadero Road Volume & Bridge Replacement Needs More Analysis

Embarcadero Road is a residential artery with over 200 driveways and should be analyzed differently than Oregon Expressway, which is a different roadway category.

In normal peak-hour traffic times, the traffic on Embarcadero moves glacially, especially through the tunnel. The addition of a light at Kingsley and Embarcadero is likely to create gridlock on Embarcadero during peak hours when traffic enters Embarcadero from Alma. There are assumptions but no clear analysis of how traffic congestion on Embarcadero Road will impact the busy neighborhood streets that surround Embarcadero and include Town and County shopping center, Palo Alto High School, Castilleja, Walter Hayes and Addison Elementary schools. Drivers using routing apps can easily navigate neighborhood streets as they attempt to avoid traffic congestion on Embarcadero Road. Because Embarcadero traffic has not been studied, the current mitigations seem insufficient to deter traffic cutting though neighborhood streets and are likely to worsen the already poor function of this artery. In the traffic consultant's presentation from February 2020, they indicate that studying Embarcadero would cost $20,000. We have no idea if this figure is accurate, but we do know that understanding traffic volume increases on Embarcadero is essential for any mitigation plan to succeed.[2]

With respect to the Alma*/* Embarcadero bridge, the traffic study expressly states: **"**Widening would require extensive modification or potential replacement of the existing bridge structure."[3] This one sentence describes a huge undertaking that has not been described or analyzed. We question the cost allotted to this building project and the engineering challenges of whether building a new overpass are properly reflected in the new proposed matrix. The traffic consultant has not conducted any analysis of this project, nor has the city, so any plans regarding modifications to this bridge are merely speculative at this time.

[2] https://connectingpaloalto.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Item3-Hexagon-Responses-to-XCAP-Traffic-Questions.pdf page 5 & 6

[3] https://connectingpaloalto.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/2020-07-22_Item-3A_Traffic-Report_Churchill_MeadowsCharleston-Grade-Separation-Analysis.pdf P 17 Paragraph 2

Definition of Mitigation Does Not Align with Council Motion

The definition of mitigation that appears on a slide 5 of the January 8, 2020 traffic presentation is as follows: “Street system changes that would allow additional capacity to accommodate diverted traffic.”

We believe this definition of mitigation is insufficient and inconsistent with the resolution adopted by City Council in June 2018 [4]. The definition proposed by Hexagon appears to focus exclusively on the volume of vehicular traffic that can be accommodated by an existing street. This definition does not consider the nature of the street in question (purely residential v. arterial), or the effect on pedestrians, bicyclists, residents, schools and businesses.

We urge the XCAP not to make any recommendation with respect to the Churchill Closure/mitigation option until there can be a more inclusive community process and thorough city planning analysis of this seemingly simple but very complex option.

Thank you for your tireless efforts on this challenging and important project.

Very truly yours,

Thomas W. Kellerman
Rachel H. Kellerman

Cc: Ed Shikada, City Manager

[4] https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?t=83343.25&BlobID=65728 Part E

Thomas W. Kellerman
Rachel H. Kellerman
1129 Emerson Street
Palo Alto, California 94301

September 11, 2020

Palo Alto Expanded Community
Advisory Panel
250 Hamilton Ave., #7
Palo Alto, CA 94301-2531

Ladies and Gentlemen:

During the discussion of the two bike/ped tunnels on Churchill Avenue at the last XCAP meeting, one member suggested completely closing Churchill to all cars except for residents to improve safety for bikes/peds who are using the tunnel. This is a laudable goal but would once again bring even more traffic to the Embarcadero corridor, as the current traffic pattern relies on Churchill as one of the routes to Alma. The closure of Churchill/Alma to vehicular traffic would further endanger bike/ped crossings on the other bike/ped path heavily used by Paly students north of Embarcadero. This is hardly an equitable solution to the bike/ped safety problem that exists around Paly, Town and Country and Stanford.

We request that no bike/ped tunnel recommendation move forward that completely closes Churchill to car traffic for the following reasons:

1. Churchill is the only street south of Embarcadero that directly connects Embarcadero to Alma. Removing this artery will push even more traffic onto Embarcadero and the Embarcadero Slip Road, further exasperating the already difficult traffic bike/ped safety situation that closure would bring to this area. Putting a traffic light further south on a street not connected to Embarcadero will not mitigate this problem.
2. Traffic relocation away from Churchill resulting from this proposal is unrelated to the closure of the at-grade crossing and accordingly it is not an appropriate decision for XCAP to propose.
3. No traffic analysis has been done on this option. In fact, as Hexagon pointed out, they never studied traffic on Embarcadero pre-COVID at all.
4. As has been previously noted multiple times, no serious analysis has been done by local bike/ped experts that city planners usually consult to analyze these options. We suggest that XCAP recommend further study for the Churchill bike tunnel options instead of making a definitive choice.
5. XCAP can suggest further study of a bike/ped tunnel at Seale that would relieve congestion at Churchill as an interim step while better plans are designed for Churchill.

Lack of representation from the Embarcadero corridor, University South, and Professorville neighborhoods means that suggestions like these often do not get challenged during XCAP deliberations. We ask that XCAP members reach out to concerned citizens when appropriate.

Thank you for your continued efforts.

Very truly yours,

Thomas W. Kellerman
Rachel H. Kellerman

Cc: Palo Alto City Council
Ed Shikada, City Manager
Philip Kamhi, Chief Transportation Official

From:	Barbara Ann Hazlett
To:	Council, City
Cc:	Shikada, Ed; Kamhi, Philip; Expanded Community Advisory Panel
Subject:	Rail - Churchill Ave. Closure
Date:	Saturday, September 19, 2020 7:56:22 PM

Dear Palo Alto City Council:

I am writing regarding the XCAP's recommendation, based on a 6-3 vote, to close Churchill Ave. at the tracks. This will be noted in their Rail Communications update to you, agenda #7, at the 9/21/20 Council meeting. As you know, this closure would be detrimental to the University South, Professorville, Embarcadero Corridor and Southgate neighborhoods. To close Churchill would dramatically and unfairly burden these neighborhoods. Thousands of cars (per the traffic consultant) would be re-routed daily onto Embarcadero. Frustrated drivers would most certainly divert to the residential streets to ease their commutes. The Southgate neighborhood would be isolated from the rest of Palo Alto. This closure would eliminate our already meager east west conduits, which are imperative for citywide response and safety matters. Also, as you know, the conceptual mitigations that have been proposed are seriously flawed.

Further, in their Churchill closure related mitigation discussion, XCAP wrote, and I quote, "explore Closing Churchill to cars on the East side of Alma - - only home owners and their guests would use the road". I imagine they will welcome emergency response if needed, but they forgot to add that to their wish list (oops). You can't make this up. Read their 9/16/20 deliberation notes. This has nothing to do with at-grade rail crossings and is certainly not within the scope of their charge from Council. I am deeply concerned that this depleted committee is biased. Apparently, the true intention is for Churchill Ave. to be entirely closed to protect their neighborhood from traffic, not to solve an at-grade crossing issue. Who doesn't want less traffic on their streets! Professorville and Embarcadero corridor residents are more than happy to go down that slippery slope. Therefore, we suggest closing Cowper, Waverley, Bryant, Emerson, High St., the Embarcadero slip road, Lincoln Ave., etc., etc., because the Churchill closure will render these streets more dangerous. To transport the traffic to other neighborhoods and create serious connectivity issues is outrageous and irresponsible.

As importantly, The COVID pandemic has created a paradigm shift with virtual space being swapped for physical space. Companies are embracing work at home for large portions of their workforce. One consequence is the plummeting of the use of mass transit. With such dislocations, no one can currently predict what the impact will be to train ridership, traffic, or work locations. Clearly the grade separation exercise needs to be put on PAUSE. It is a colossal waste of time, money and destruction of a town to address an issue whose underlying assumptions are no longer valid.

Best Regards,

Barbara Hazlett
Professorville, Palo Alto

From:	Inder Monga
To:	Expanded Community Advisory Panel; Council, City; Shikada, Ed; Kamhi, Philip; Gaines, Chantal; Reshma Singh
Subject:	City Council Meeting Agenda Item. #7 (September 21, 2020)
Date:	Sunday, September 20, 2020 6:56:21 PM
Attachments:	Community letter to XCAP City Council July 28 2020 FINAL.docx

Date: September 20, 2020

Dear Honorable Council Members:

We are writing with deep concern with regard to the Expanded Community Advisory Panel (XCAP) update report. This will be covered under Agenda item #7 for the City Council meeting scheduled for Monday, September 21, 2020.

We would like to highlight three major concerns that make the idea of Churchill closure inequitable, biased, and likely dangerous:

1. There are critical facts, significant citizen opinion, safety concerns, and important uncertainties that have not been taken into account, due to which a hasty decision should not be taken to close Churchill

2. The XCAP process itself has become flawed and membership not representative of the Palo Alto neighborhoods. The current vote should be accounted as 6-3-5, since 5 of the original members have since left (and not replaced), including the sole member who was disproportionately expected to represent all the neighborhoods of North Palo Alto and the Embarcadero corridor.

3. The traffic study has egregious gaps: it is inadequately goal-posted to 2030, and does not take into account any local community ground-truth of dangerous traffic patterns. The proposed “mitigations” exacerbates the already beleaguered Embarcadero crossing by dumping the congestion and safety burden at the Embarcadero intersection that serves five regional destinations: An international university Stanford, regional retail and offices at Downtown Palo Alto, Town and Country village, and two high schools Castilleja and Palo Alto High. Most importantly, the “mitigation” plan mitigates only a limited metric, the “level of service”, with little concern for the walkability, bikeability and safety of our school-children.

This is not just our voice alone. The PAUSD Superintendent’s note to XCAP expresses their

serious concerns about Churchill closure. 56% of Southgate residents have voiced the importance of keeping Churchill open in a recent neighborhood survey as the original cloverleaf design for Churchill (with eminent domain issues) is not under consideration any more.

Similar concerns were communicated in a community letter to the Council, City Managers, and XCAP on July 25th (attached).

Please see below, details on each of these issues.

Dramatic shift in vehicle traffic patterns and potentially, the rail corridor

- There has been a dramatic shift in commuting patterns, with large segments of the population now permanently teleworking including from companies in downtown SFO locations. The old Caltrain projections cannot be trusted for future planning given the unprecedented COVID era. It may well be that the frequency of trains would at best be status quo to pre-COVID, which makes any changes at Churchill a moot point.

- Vehicular traffic patterns have, and will continue to change significantly, that negates any forward projections of the traffic study. Any decisions made on an outdated traffic study that could not forecast post-pandemic scenarios would not be appropriate.

- Any unsubstantiated decisions taken without incorporating the scenario analyses mentioned above would tie up the City's hands unnecessarily or make it difficult to retract.

PAUSD input ignored and not mitigated in XCAP vote/recommendation

- The PAUSD Superintendent's concerns in an email to the XCAP and Council have largely been ignored. Even in the document shared by XCAP with you today, the only issue documented for consideration is that "may negatively impact student safety related to bicycle commuters".

  This selective highlight by XCAP ignores the impact on buses and maintenance vehicles where Churchill is the preferred single entry/exit point. The children could be spending much more time in buses during peak times. Additional text from the letter is shared verbatim below:

  > *"PAUSD deploys 22 busses each day to various parts of Palo Alto and East Palo Alto. Currently, our busses cross Alma Street at Churchill over 20 times per day as part of routine business. This does not include athletic or other extra-curricular trips. Our only entrance to our transportation yard is on*

Churchill. Practically speaking, ***a closure of Churchill would force every bus onto El Camino to make a right or left turn****.*

Our Maintenance and Operations fleet crosses Alma and Churchill approximately 175 times per day. This includes vans, trucks, and trailers. ***As described for our busses, the maintenance yard also depends upon a single entry/exit point on Churchill.****"*

This example does not give the Palo Alto citizens confidence that the issues brought up by the stakeholder community are being taken seriously by the XCAP in their deliberations and their vote.

Traffic study and mitigation analysis is inadequate

The traffic study has serious flaws that have been brought up by the community members several times. The community members even had to commission an external professional evaluation which underscored the flaws in the analysis. The data presented to the community in the VR townhall site is based on that flawed traffic study, influencing the opinions of the people. Some of the points stated before:

- The traffic study uses a highly limited level of service (LOS) metric for automobiles and ignores the impacts to the very busy school/community bicycle and pedestrian route that runs along Embarcadero. Traffic calming devices or bike routes along the road would not adequately mitigate the heavy regional traffic impact in the new unsubstantiated design.

- The traffic study does not even provide a current count of cars traveling Embarcadero and other affected neighborhood streets because the consultants were not asked to do so. It makes no sense to design a plan that routes thousands more cars onto Embarcadero Road and neighborhood streets when there is no baseline count of the number of cars that take this busy roadway before mitigations are enacted.

- The report did not address even the intersection level of service (LOS) and operating conditions at the new signalized intersection of Embarcadero Road/Kingsley Avenue. This should be addressed both for automobiles, pedestrians and bicyclists.

- The report does not adequately calculate the true cost of changes to the Embarcadero/Alma bridge that will be required to implement the mitigations suggested.

This disruptive pandemic is an opportunity for City Council and the people of Palo Alto consider a holistic view of ALL the crossings in town (including Palo Alto Avenue), make

evidence based decisions, incorporate the principles behind the Comprehensive Plan, address inconsistencies in XCAP guidance, remove any neighborhood bias by improving representation of the various impacted communities, and proceed with a more harmonized view of the city inclusive of both east and west sides of the tracks.

The Churchill closure idea has already started to polarize the community. Without appropriate study, new post-COVID scenario analyses, and community-ground-truthed mitigation, the inequity propagated will completely fracture the Palo Alto community, compromise the safety of our children and irreparably damage the livability of our town.

Honorable Council, your decision will impact the City for decades, and careful consideration and response to these points is needed.

Thank you, and in appreciation,

Reshma Singh and Inder Monga

Date: July 25th, 2020

Dear City Council, City Manager, and Palo Alto Expanded Community Advisory Panel,

We would like to acknowledge and thank the tireless work being done by the XCAP committee, the city staff and the City Council as all of us work through the challenging issues of grade separation across the multiple crossings in Palo Alto.

This letter is from a collection of residents of Professorville, Southgate and the Embarcadero Corridor who have been actively participating in and monitoring the deliberations of the XCAP and City Council regarding mitigation of the Caltrain corridor's effect on the Churchill crossing and beyond. We are strongly of the view that neither the XCAP nor the City Council has developed **sufficient data or community input** to adopt specific recommendations or approve a specific solution for this crossing at this time. Moreover, in light of current circumstances and uncertainties, we believe that the **adoption of a recommendation now is both unnecessary and inappropriate**.

The points below articulate the sentiments of the neighborhood residents:

Pandemic Phase Change

The pandemic has caused a radical, possibly permanent "phase change" in our environment in a number of ways:

Caltrain: A projected increase in the number of commuter trains prompted the discussion of grade separation in Palo Alto (https://connectingpaloalto.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/2020-07-08_Item3a_Memo-to-XCAP-from-Chair.pdf - Item 1.1). However, ridership is down 95%+ since March, with as few as 15 riders per train (PA Daily Post, 'Caltrain tax battle escalates,' 7/20/20).

Moreover, as we heard from Caltrain representatives last week, deep funding issues all but guarantee that Caltrain won't increase the number of trains in the foreseeable future. Caltrain's pre Covid 19 business plan, calling for increased service (increased number of trains), has been paused (https://www.caltrain.com/projectsplans/Business_Plan.html), and Caltrain has shifted its focus to recovery planning.

Vehicle Traffic and Remote Work: Because of the Covid 19 crisis, car usage has dropped substantially throughout Palo Alto and Silicon Valley (https://www.ite.org/about-ite/covid-19-resources/covid-19-traffic-volume-trends/) as substantial numbers of commuters have shifted to working remotely. Even though the shift was occasioned by the pandemic, a May 2020 Bay Area Council survey of 100 businesses found that 20% of the firms surveyed expect to go fully remote post-Covid 19. Executives in the other

firms surveyed said they expect only 74% of their workers to return to working in the office. Just today, Siemens announced it will permit its employees to work remotely up to three days/week - permanently (https://www.inc.com/justin-bariso/this-companys-new-2-sentence-remote-work-policy-is-best-ive-ever-heard.html?cid=search), while Google announced its employees can work from home for another year, until July 2021 (https://www.npr.org/sections/coronavirus-live-updates/2020/07/27/895734132/google-employees-can-work-from-home-until-july-2021).

Covid 19 Timeframe: There may still be a lengthy wait before a Covid 19 vaccine is developed and made available for everyone, which portends continued social distancing and continued associated impact on mass transit, including Caltrain. "Even if the optimists are right and a COVID-19 vaccine is approved for widespread use as early as this fall, it is likely to be in short supply at first." https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2020/06/line-forming-covid-19-vaccine-who-should-be-front

This phase change is causing a dramatic shift, **with virtual space being swapped for physical space**. "Work at home" and more dramatically "work anywhere" is the new reality for large portions of the workforce. We can't currently predict the future impact on either mass transit or traffic.

Caltrain Corridor Study

At the same time, Caltrain is commencing a two-year study of grade separations along the entire rail corridor with the aim of producing coordinated design, construction, and funding solutions and streamlining the exceptions process. Palo Alto may well forfeit the benefits of this process if the City proceeds with recommendations for Palo Alto grade crossings before it is even underway.

XCAP Representation

When the City Manager and City Council reconstituted the CAP as the XCAP, the neighborhood representatives who served on the CAP largely stayed in place and pledged to shift their focus from neighborhood engagement and advocacy to a community-wide perspective. New members from various constituencies were supposed to further broaden the group's expertise. Representation has now dropped from 14 members to 9, including 4 of the 5 members who represented the broader view (PAUSD, Chamber of Commerce, Friends of Caltrain, and a rail crossing safety organization). Ongoing lack of representation from Stanford and Palo Alto Bike/Ped safety groups clearly adds to this concern. Moreover, with the resignation of Megan Kanne, the CAP/XCAP member who originally engaged with the communities north of and around the western portion of Embarcadero, residents in those neighborhoods are concerned that their voices are not being heard.

Similarly, a large portion of Southgate residents who favor a solution that keeps the Churchill crossing open, share the same worry. Further, neighborhoods adjacent to Embarcadero

corridor, which will be impacted by any decision, are troubled by the lack of community outreach.

We understand that a primary goal of XCAP and City Council is to garner broad community support for grade crossing decisions. With the disruptions caused by the pandemic, plans to engage the community through Town Halls and other means have not been enacted, which should itself be a reason for pause.

Traffic Studies and Mitigation Proposals

As XCAP and City Council Members may be aware, the traffic studies conducted by Hexagon failed to take into account a number of critical, real-world factors likely to shift their analysis. Examples of such factors include population and traffic increases in line with Caltrain and regional projections, the interactions between peak hour traffic and the large numbers of bicyclists and pedestrians traveling to Palo Alto schools, among others. Requests from both XCAP members and the public to address these issues have yet to be addressed. There are a number of other areas in which the Hexagon's report appears incomplete and inadequate.

- The traffic study only looks at car traffic (LOS) and ignores the impacts to the very busy school/community bicycle and pedestrian route that runs along the north side of Embarcadero. Indeed, Embarcadero Road is an official Palo Alto bicycle route, but that fact not reflected in the conceptual design
- While the traffic study looks at impacts of increased rail traffic and various rail crossing alternatives to car traffic, it does so in a limited way, focusing only on wait times at a few intersections (LOS). Effects of closure or other rail separation alternatives on Vehicle Miles Traveled, total transit times, or other important measures are not considered.
- The traffic study does not even provide a current count of cars traveling Embarcadero and other affected corridors because the consultants were not asked to do so. It makes no sense to design a plan that routes thousands more cars onto Embarcadero Road when there is no baseline count of the number of cars that take this busy roadway before mitigations are enacted.
- Similarly, the traffic analysis fails to provide a count of bicycle and pedestrian traffic and to base mitigation proposals on the study of interactions between cars and bike/ped traffic. Residents did a daily count of bicycles and pedestrians that crossed the busy intersection of Emerson/Kingsley/Embarcadero between 7:30-8:30 am on a typical school day and counted 300 bike/ped crossings and 100 cars that stopped or "paused" at the stop sign; however that data has not been considered in the mitigation plan.
- Traffic mitigation plans for this area should include a Kingsley/Embarcadero bike/pedestrian route that is safe enough to qualify for "safe route to school" designation.

Requests from both XCAP members and the public to address these issues have yet to be answered.

In addition to our concerns about the traffic study, we question the cost allotted to the Churchill closure alternative and associated mitigation plan, as well as the characterization of the engineering challenges represented in the Summary Matrix and Factsheet. Specifically, we

anticipate that retrofitting and substantially expanding the Embarcadero overpass will likely entail considerable time, seismic upgrades and other technical challenges, and substantial expenses that are not reflected in the current documentation. We are aware of no detailed, publicly available analysis of this part of the project, so any plans that include modifications to the overpass are merely speculative at this time.

As a result, the rosy conclusions about the efficacy of the proposed mitigations on Embarcadero are not viewed as credible by most area residents.

Palo Alto Avenue Crossing

Changes to the Palo Alto Avenue crossing will have reverberating effects on other crossings in town, particularly Embarcadero, Oregon, and El Camino Real, with spill-over effects on neighborhood streets. It is unrealistic and unfair not to consider how residents may be affected by changes to Palo Alto Ave when choosing among alternatives elsewhere, like Churchill crossing and Embarcadero traffic mitigation.

XCAP Deliberations

XCAP is going into deliberations before these issues can be raised and discussed in front of the City Council and changes in guidance formulated. Currently, XCAP can only issue recommendations based on incomplete and overly-conceptual traffic studies, a soon-to-be-outmoded Caltrain review process for grade separations, and other work done pre-COVID.

We do recognize that the XCAP was given a charge to provide these recommendations. However, that charge was based on certain underlying assumptions at that time, assumptions which are now outdated and no longer valid. Given this, any recommendations the XCAP makes based on outdated assumptions, may also end up - outdated.

Time to Pause

The new normal in work and commute patterns is an opportunity for the City Council, XCAP, and the City Manager. With increased Caltrain service no longer a motivator, there is no driver for Churchill closure, and postponing a recommendation for the time being is a viable and workable option. There is time to do what needs to be done, namely to address the following issues and developments:

- Caltrain's changing operating plans
- Possible shifts in work/commute patterns throughout Silicon Valley
- Gaps in neighborhood representation & drop in the diversity of the committee's members
- Omission of the impact of the Palo Alto Avenue crossing
- Major inadequacies in the existing traffic/mitigation analysis
- Opening of possibilities with Caltrain's comprehensive study of rail crossings across the entire corridor and reconfiguring of their exceptions process

More positively, this disruptive pandemic should be seen as an opportunity for City Council and the people of Palo Alto to pause the current process and regroup, in order to consider a holistic view of ALL the crossings in town, incorporate the principles behind the Comprehensive Plan, address inconsistencies in XCAP guidance, remove any neighborhood bias by improving representation of the various impacted communities, and proceed with a more harmonized view of the city inclusive of both east and west sides of the tracks.

XCAP's Excellent Work

We reiterate our appreciation of the volunteer XCAP committee and their committed engagement over the past year. Although we believe they are not in a position to issue recommendations, their efforts should not go to waste. City Council, Staff, and Palo Alto residents will benefit from the review of what they have learned about the many constraints and considerations involved in modifying our at-grade crossings, as well as their qualitative assessments of the alternatives. They are also in a uniquely qualified position to articulate the questions that remain to be answered and the aspects that need to be studied further.

Our Request

With all due respect to the City Council, the City Manager, the volunteer XCAP committee, and the Palo Alto citizens, we request that XCAP's **goal be modified to acknowledge the dramatically altered state of current affairs** as well as the limitations of their investigations and analyses, and to **refrain from making final recommendations**.

Sincerely

Inder Monga
Reshma Singh
Michael Chacon
Mary Chacon
Rachel Kellerman
Tom Kellerman
Kathy Jordan
William Chandler
Susan Newman
James O'Donohue
Steven Carlson
Husna Hashmi
Jahangir Hashmi
Dexter Girton
Sara Girton
Beverly Sarver
Dan Nitzan
Susan Nitzan
Susan Mitchell

Terry Rice
Barbara Hazlett
William (Butch) Hazlett
Lisa Nissim
Katherine K Wilson
Lucia Ugarte
Rich Spott
Rob Levitsky
Carl Dowds
Margaret Kim
Nancy Patterson
David Schellinger
Caroline Japic
Haris Japic
Eileen Fagan
Loreto Ponce de Leon
Karen Hohner
Yoriko Kishimoto
Prasad Chakka

From: Ronald Pyszka
To: Expanded Community Advisory Panel
Subject: Charleston and Meadow Grade Separation
Date: Monday, September 21, 2020 1:01:33 PM
Attachments: Rail Crossings (revised).docx

To: Members of XCAP

From: Ronald Pyszka

The attached letter dated September 21, 2020 is a revision of the letter that I submitted on September 9. It takes into account comments made at the XCAP meeting of September 16 and additional conversations with neighbors.

Since it contains several substantial changes, I would appreciate your taking the time to read it.

Thank you very much.

September 21, 2020

Charleston-Meadow Grade Separation Options

This is a revision of my letter of September 9. It takes into account comments made at the XCAP meeting of September 16 and further conversations with neighbors.

Let me begin by saying that for nearly 25 years I regularly commuted to work by bicycle on a route took me across the Charleston crossing. I have also written letters and spoken before the City Council on multiple occasions in support of pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements along the Charleston-Arastradero corridor.

That said, I am vehemently opposed to the Underpass option for the Charleston-Meadow rail crossings.

Mode separation is a desirable aspect of the Underpass option. However, I do not believe that the Underpass option offers a significant advantage in pedestrian and bicycle safety over the Trench, Hybrid, and Viaduct options. As a bicyclist, I would be happy with any of them. In fact, as an older bicyclist, I would prefer them.

Moreover, with its twists, turns, and ramps, the Underpass option is very unfriendly to seniors, mobility-impaired pedestrians, people pushing strollers, etc. I see many of these people using the Charleston crossing, including grandparents pushing their grandchildren in strollers and baby carriages. The Underpass option favors one population (physically-fit bicyclists) at the expense of others.

Whatever the benefits of the Underpass option, they come at a huge cost to the Walnut Grove neighborhood (and to portions of the Fairmeadow neighborhood as well).

The proposed Charleston Road traffic circle would require the acquisition/seizure of two private residences. It would also require the acquisition/seizure of parts of the back yards of a number of other residences. XCAP has also raised the possibility of acquiring/seizing the house at the Northeast corner of Charleston and Alma.

When the City Council authorized inclusion of the Underpass option as an additional alternative to be studied, the concept for Charleston Road called for a U-turn at Wright Place. Since then, it has morphed into this monstrous traffic circle and the seizure of people's homes and yards.

The City Council has previously said that it would not consider acquiring/seizing private property, a position it should stick to. We are talking about fundamental disruption of people's lives. Nothing can compensate for being forced to move out of one's home. Is this how Palo Alto wants to treat its residents?

The negative impacts of the Charleston Underpass go far beyond the property acquisitions/seizures themselves.

Houses adjacent to the traffic circle (those on each side of it and those whose back yards abut it) as well as others in the general vicinity will suffer from noise, exhaust pollution, and decreased property values. This promises to be a very congested traffic circle. Incidentally, it would not be unreasonable to expect a rash of property-owner lawsuits if this option is selected.

Houses on Charleston between Alma Street and the traffic circle (those with front yards facing Charleston on the south side of Charleston and those with back yards facing Charleston on the north side of Charleston) will be forced to endue a huge increase in traffic resulting from the various convoluted turns that require use of the traffic circle (e.g., a left turn from north bound Alma to west bound Charleston). Charleston Road, this section included, has been designated a residential/school corridor. Residents worked for more than a decade to calm automobile traffic on Charleston, not increase it by adding cars making turns from Alma.

To the east of the proposed traffic circle, residents of houses between Mumford and Carlson will find it extremely difficult to back out of their driveways since there will no longer be traffic lights to provide an occasional break in traffic. This is a very real issue and one that affects my wife and me directly.

With only one lane in each direction beneath the railroad tracks and with a traffic circle that promises to be congested from the outset, the Charleston Underpass option is the one that is most prone to becoming obsolete if automobile traffic continues to increase in coming decades. We all hope that traffic growth can be constrained, but we also need to be realistic, particularly since a large portion of the automobile traffic on Charleston originates outside of Palo Alto and is unlikely to be influenced by Palo Alto's traffic initiatives. Twenty years ago, I never would have predicted the increase in traffic that we have subsequently seen. A certain amount of foresight and prudence is called for when making infrastructure investments of this magnitude.

Having lived on East Charleston Road for many years, I am keenly aware of traffic movement on Charleston at various times of day. It is very hard for me to believe that the Underpass option will function smoothly. I foresee major rush hour backups as traffic on Charleston is forced to merge with traffic making various turns to and from Alma, leading to even more noise and air pollution.

In summary, the many significant disadvantages of the Underpass option far outweigh its advantages. Even if the benefits were more compelling, I would find it impossible to support it for the reasons stated above.

None of the remaining options is perfect, but all of them are vastly preferable to the Underpass option.

So, what is the best option?

I understand that the two tunnel options have already been taken off the table and so I will not address them. If they have not in fact been ruled out, I would treat them much as I do the Trench option.

1. Trench. The trench option has much to be said in its favor. It is the most esthetically pleasing and unobtrusive of all the options. **Even more importantly, it is the only option that does not pit one neighborhood against another.** Palo Alto will not be well served by a decision that leaves lasting resentments.

Additionally, with the railroad tracks underground, pedestrian and bicycle lanes could be widened and separated by bowing them out. This would not require the seizure of any property.

The disadvantages of the Trench option are its high cost and some engineering issues related to the creeks. I have to believe that the engineering issues can be solved. Palo Alto is not the first place to encounter issues of this kind. That leaves cost as the principal stumbling block. And cost is a particularly big issue in the current post-COVID economic environment.

Thus, my recommendation is as follows: The City Council should select the trench option on the condition that funding can be secured within a specified period of time (e.g., five years). The City should then vigorously pursue funding sources, including the possibility of new taxes. If at the end of the specified time period the City is unable to secure funding, a previously chosen fallback option should be implemented. This approach will give the trench option a fair chance of succeeding as the economic environment improves.

This is a good time to take this approach. Automobile traffic on Charleston and Meadow is likely to rebound slowly over the next couple of years as some employees continue to work from home. Also, some of the company buses and other cut-through drivers that currently use Charleston can be expected to gravitate to Oregon and San Antonio.

2. Hybrid. If the City Council deems it necessary to move ahead rapidly with the Charleston and Meadow grade separation projects, the Hybrid option is the most compelling of the remaining options**. It represents a reasonable compromise at a relatively affordable cost.**

The projected cost of the Hybrid option is $190-230 million, whereas the projected cost of the Underpass option is $340-420 million. In this time of financial deficits and service cutbacks stemming from the COVID-19 crisis, this is a **substantial difference**. Funding, whatever its source, will be hard to come by in the next two years. And the Churchill crossing needs to be funded as well.

3. Viaduct. The Viaduct option would be faster and less disruptive to build. Nevertheless, it is substantially more obtrusive than the Hybrid option without the cost advantage of that option. The Hybrid option is a much better choice. However, as I have said previously, even the Viaduct is a better option that the Underpass option.

The above comments represent my personal opinions. However, all of the Walnut Grove neighbors with whom I have spoken are strongly opposed to the Underpass option.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ronald H. Pyszka
284 East Charleston Road

From:	Arnout Boelens
To:	Expanded Community Advisory Panel
Cc:	Reckdahl, Keith
Subject:	How to reduce Traffic congestion (by offering viable alternatives)
Date:	Monday, September 21, 2020 3:50:55 PM

Dear XCAP members,

Traffic congestion has been a frequent and recurring theme during the recent XCAP meetings I have attended, with Level of Service (LOS) being cited as the way to assess the viability and effectiveness of various road designs. However, it appears that historically using the LOS framework has not solved the problem of traffic congestion on our roads.

I'd like to offer an insightful perspective on why LOS may not be working to alleviate traffic congestion in Palo Alto: the Downs–Thomson paradox.
This paradox emerged as an observation in the 60's. It found that the amount of congestion on a road was correlated to the amount of time traveling the same distance would take using public transportation. For example, if arriving at work by train takes an hour, people are willing to sit in traffic for 59 minutes. If they sit in traffic longer than an hour, then they will switch to transit (assuming it is not significantly more expensive than driving). This feedback loop thus limits the amount of traffic congestion.

More recent studies have found that the Downs–Thomson paradox can be generalized to apply to alternative modes beyond public transportation, such as biking or walking. Consequently, **unless people are offered a viable alternative to commute to work and run errands, traffic congestion in Palo Alto will stay as bad as it is, regardless of any proposed LOS mitigation solutions.**

Applying this paradox to, for instance, Embarcadero Road, it would make sense to build a safe and low stress segregated bicycle path from Bryant Street to Town and Country, Paly, and Galvez Street, instead of putting some green paint on the sidewalk. This approach would offer people a safe, viable alternative to get to these destinations. It is also, potentially, a more cost-effective solution compared to other proposed mitigation solutions that attempt to slightly improve the LOS for motorized traffic.

The only viable solution to reduce traffic congestion is to increase the mode share of alternative transportation options, like walking and cycling, by designing streets that make cyclists and pedestrians feel safe.

Thank you for your continued service to our community and for considering how we might improve the quality of life for all residents.

Kind regards,

Arnout Boelens

References:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Downs%E2%80%93Thomson_paradox

"The law of peak-hour expressway congestion" by Anthony Downs in "Traffic Quarterly" (1962)

"Great cities and their traffic" by John Thomson (1978)

"The Role of Walking and Cycling in Reducing Congestion: A Portfolio of Measures." by Thorsten Koska and Frederic Rudolph, FLOW Project (http://www.h2020-flow.eu) (2016)

https://cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/31928
Figure 5-2: Four Types of Bicyclists

"60% interested but concerned" - residents that would like to bike on our streets.

From:	Eric Sheffer
To:	Expanded Community Advisory Panel; Transportation
Subject:	Partial underpass designs
Date:	Wednesday, September 23, 2020 10:40:50 AM
Attachments:	Screen Shot 2020-09-23 at 10.33.39 AM.png Screen Shot 2020-09-23 at 10.34.44 AM.png Screen Shot 2020-09-23 at 10.34.24 AM.png Screen Shot 2020-09-23 at 10.33.23 AM.png Screen Shot 2020-09-23 at 10.35.07 AM.png

---

Hello,
I am a student at Palo Alto High School, and I have come up with some concept sketches for a potential Churchill partial underpass. These are not scale drawings; just concept sketches. The style is a Spanish style to match the high school buildings, and will blend in with the surrounding neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration,
Eric Sheffer