

Expanded Community Advisory Panel (XCAP)

December 16, 2020, 4:00 pm

Summary - Special Meeting (virtual, through Zoom)

1. Welcome and Roll Call

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

Absent:

2. Staff Updates

Ripon Bhatia, Senior Engineer answered questions from XCAP. The first question was about the shoofly linear cost. The cost per linear foot was \$550 per track foot.

XCAP Member Burton asked if a street has to be prepared to receive a shoofly track bed and was that included in these costs?

Mr. Bhatia assumed it would be to the Caltrain standards but he would confirm that.

XCAP Member Burton then asked if the cost of restoration of the street is also included?

Mr. Bhatia thought that might be in a separate item.

XCAP Member Reckdahl inquired if the OCS was for one track, and for double tracks would the cost be for two OCSs?

Mr. Bhatia responded it was per linear foot so he assumed it would provide for both.

XCAP Member Reckdahl clarified a double track would be a total of \$1500 per track foot.

Mr. Bhatia moved to question 2, regarding sliver takes. He noted it could vary, but could be 1 to 2 feet, but less than 10 feet. Question 3 addressed a cost factor when considering a 1 percent slope rather than 2 or 1.4 percent. The response was no because that has to be customized to the slope.

Chair Naik added that in the estimates on the matrix and fact sheets, the only alternative that only goes 1 percent is the hybrid.

Mr. Bhatia noted question 4 asked about the maintenance costs for various alternatives. No long-term maintenance costs have been developed at this point, but Caltrain indicated they will take maintenance responsibility of new infrastructure under certain circumstances.

Chair Naik asked XCAP Members if there was a place that addressed the cost of maintaining the viaduct?

XCAP Member Brail thought the Churchill document addressed that.

Chair Naik then noted this indicated there would be no additional cost of a viaduct because Caltrain would assume maintenance, and that needed to be changed in the fact sheets and the matrix.

Mr. Bhatia advised the last question was about the right-of-way temporary impacts during construction of options 1 and 2 of the Churchill Closure and the partial underpass alternative for Churchill Avenue. The answer was that the temporary impacts would be present for all alternatives.

Chair Naik asked Mr. Bhatia for a good definition for longitudinal and transverse encroachments from Caltrain.

XCAP Member Klein did not that kind of detail was necessary in the report.

Chair Naik replied in trying to decide between options 1 and 2, the difference between a permanent encroachment and a temporary encroachment?

There was discussion between members about these terms.

Mr. Bhatia advised this document will be made as an attachment to the next agenda.

3. Oral Communications

Roland commented that on the BART extension the average operating subsidy for the first six months was \$300 per passenger. It is known for a fact that the cost for phase one is \$1.1 billion over budget. The VTA is the only agency in the Bay Area that there is a surplus of funding. It was proposed that the VTA work with Caltrain and use the surplus money so half of the trains on the new schedule go all the way to Gilroy.

4. XCAP Member Updates and Working Group Updates

XCAP Member Shen explained how the Table of Contents was built. He noted with the process being used it was very difficult to coordinate all the sections.

XCAP Member Burton noted the first thing that was apparent when he looked at the Table of Contents was that the Churchill document organization was different from Meadow/Charleston. The Table of Contents should reflect the structure of the whole report design. He felt the average reader would be better served by two large self-standing chapters with all the issues and topics inside.

Chair Naik agreed with that but thought the difference was the numbering of the chapters.

XCAP felt the structure of the report was confusing.

XCAP Member Brail expressed that everything in the Table of Contents from 3.3 down is 3.3 something and he felt it was just a numbering issue.

Chair Naik explained the reason for the Churchill section numbering was that originally the Churchill options were partial underpass, then viaduct, then closure. She had suggested it was easier to understand the partial underpass bike tunnel if the closure with mitigation options was seen before that.

XCAP Member Burton was addressing the entire Table of Contents and those sections.

Chair Naik asked if the section going into detailed comparisons of the options worked better or belonged somewhere else?

XCAP Member Brail explained that four individual teams wrote four individual documents then he had to condense that into one document for Meadow and Charleston.

XCAP Member Burton hoped that after the report is written there will be an opportunity to review the near final report and possibly come to a recommendation. For discussion now, he recommended making Chapter 3 Churchill and Chapter 4, Meadow/Charleston and asked what the internal outline of each chapter would look like?

XCAP Member Carrasco thought the summary and conclusions written by Member Brail was very useful. He felt it should be in Chapter 5.

XCAP Member Cho suggested a template for the document.

Chair Naik responded using a template is hard to do because the information in each section is not the same.

XCAP Member Shen advised there was a template that everyone tried to follow and at this point it may be time to look at the template because it has changed constantly. He shared the two Table of Contents, the old and new on the screen.

The changes between the two Table of Contents were discussed by Members as well as placement of some content.

XCAP Member Templeton believed what was described was integrating all the work of XCAP, the contractors and staff into one document and she felt staff should be involved in this.

Chair Naik indicated XCAP may get a small amount of help from a copy editor towards the end. This, hopefully, will include help with the graphics. XCAP will still be editing the content in words. She then asked for input regarding placement of the pictures.

XCAP Member Shen felt part of the problems was using the blind screen capture to create the graphics. If everyone sent him all the graphics, he offered to run it through photo shop to reduce everything.

This was discussed by the group.

Mr. Bhatia shared that all the pictures on AECOM's vrpaloalto.com site are currently reduced in size.

Chair Naik requested help from staff to obtain these pictures. She noted she will be working with Sarah Wilson from staff to get all the public comments XCAP has received since the XCAP email was set up into PDFs that can be put in the Appendix. She encouraged putting as many documents that exist into the Appendix.

5. Writing and Editing of Final Report

Public Comment

None.

XCAP Member Comments

Chair Naik started with the dissenting opinion for Churchill section. She started that work and hoped to have it done after the holiday break. She talked with XCAP Member Klein about having a majority opinion, a dissenting opinion, and a rebuttal to the dissenting opinion. The dissenting opinion is public so if there is something members want to rebut specifically in the dissenting opinion, that can be put in the "this is why we chose it" section.

XCAP Member Cho felt if the dissenting opinion is longer than the majority opinion that was discussed, there is something wrong with that. Also, she felt what was discussed was very insignificant. Anything written about that should look at the tone of the discussion and write it in a similar tone.

Chair Naik agreed with Member Cho.

XCAP Member Carrasco noted there was some indication that he supported the viaduct around Churchill. He wanted to make it clear that he did not support that.

Chair Naik explained that was meant to indicate his support of his version of the viaduct, not the proposed viaduct.

XCAP Member Carrasco agreed with that.

Chair Naik noted on her list was moving the history of the underpass section into the Appendix and the definition of "sliver" can be defined in Key Terms. She sent out the leanings chart to Members and asked for input.

This was discussed by the Members.

Chair Naik advised that at this point she and XCAP Member Klein will break off from their current groups and form their own group to review everything and the remaining groups will continue with their work.

XCAP Member Templeton had questions about Churchill, additional mitigations, traffic mitigations, public opinion.

These were discussed by XCAP Members.

XCAP Member Brail pointed out several changes he made in the City Council-Adopted Criteria.

These changes were discussed along with other changes in the Churchill section.

Chair Naik then moved the Members to the Meadow/Charleston section.

XCAP Member Shen explained the changes he made to this section.

Changes to this section and other suggestions were then discussed by XCAP Members.

The general structure of the document was then discussed.

Chair Naik then clarified groups. Group one consists of Chair Naik and XCAP Member Klein. Group two consists of Members Templeton, Reckdahl and Brail. Group three consists of Members Shen, Cho and Burton. XCAP Member Carrasco will work on his minority opinion and what he wants to put into the Appendix. She and Member Klein will start reading the report from the beginning and work on flow and graphics. She asked everyone to work on their sections and, if possible, review the glossary and timeline.

6. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 6:41 pm