



CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES

Special Meeting
Transportation Workshop
April 29, 2024

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers and by virtual teleconference at 5:30 P.M.

Present In Person: Burt, Kou, Lauing, Lythcott-Haims, Stone, Tanaka, Veenker

Present Remotely:

Absent:

Call to Order

Mayor Stone called the meeting to order, and roll was taken.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Ed Shikada, City Manager, stated there were no agenda changes. He also noted this was a Special Meeting of the Council specifically on transportation, with no City Manager comments and no public comments.

TRANSPORTATION WORKSHOP: STUDY SESSIONS

1. Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan (BPTP) Update: Review and discuss the vision statement, objectives, performance measures, and share and obtain feedback on the existing conditions technical analysis.

Amanda Leahy, Kittelson & Associates, Consultant, reviewed the meeting purpose and agenda. She discussed findings of the analysis. Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) is a rating indicating the stress a road signal or crossing imposes on bicyclists with level 1 indicating a low-stress facility and 4 indicating a high-stress facility. Lower-stress facilities are separated or off-road paths that are often wider. She presented a map showing the level of stress on city streets, with 68% of streets in Palo Alto determined to be LTS 1 or 2 but often disconnected by the higher-stress roadways and

SUMMARY MINUTES

intersections. Analysis of major barriers examined freeways, creeks, rail lines, and areas that need transit. The results of this analysis inform the locations and types of treatments needed to create more direct connections. For example, the lack of crossing opportunities at US 101 results in trips that are almost 4 times longer than the straight line crossing. She presented a graph of the 10-year collision history, showing a decreasing number of pedestrian and bicycle collisions, with further detail on the 5-year collision history, with a concentration in downtown and near higher-activity centers, including schools. She presented a map showing concentrations of fatal and severe-injury collisions and discussed the demographics of walking and biking activity.

Ms. Leahy described the community engagement thus far and showed the revised draft vision statement as well as the draft objectives. The draft objectives are grouped into five topics: safe and inclusive, connected and accessible, comfortable and enjoyable, community-led, and integrated and collaborative. Draft performance measures will be used to help identify and select projects as well as track the impact of investments over time to evaluate how the City is meeting goals related to biking and walking. The selection of these measures is a key step in the development of the plan and network recommendations. She reviewed the next steps and recommended action.

Council Member Burt noted the draft objectives were different from the prior objectives. He was surprised that GHGs and atmospheric pollutants as well as community health were not included. He did not see references to the benefits of parking demand reduction and traffic reduction in the objectives. He felt the attention spent on bikes and peds also benefits drivers who then have to park and that it should be framed that way. He asked if there was an opportunity for the council members to sit down with the consultants for further discussion.

Ozzy Arce, Senior Transportation Planner, explained that Reduce Emissions was one of the draft performance measures and that the City's existing S/CAP addresses GHG emissions.

Council Member Veenker felt it would be helpful to connect collision information on whether the incidents occurred at night/in the dark. She was interested in more specifically including climate and GHG goals in the objectives and vision statement, for example using wording that encourages walking and biking. She also felt education was missing from the objectives. She questioned where a road with bollards would fit into the Level of Traffic Stress analysis.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Ms. Leahy responded that bollards reduce the level of stress and a separated bike lane would generally be an LTS 1 facility.

Vice Mayor Lauing asked if the data that darkness was causing collisions suggested the City should be more significantly investing in lighting and whether that was a bigger cost element than expected. He was interested in more current studies on bike user behavior as E-bikes are becoming more common. He noted the map data did not seem to include anything west of 280 and wondered if that area was included in the injury rates.

Ms. Leahy answered that the need for lighting was very important and agreed that it was a bigger cost element. She stated rider count information will be collected and incorporated into the plan, including the types of bikes people are using as a data point. She explained the analysis included all of the street network within the city limits.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims echoed the importance of everyone embracing the objectives and commitments, not just the fervent cyclists and pedestrians. This is in everyone's interest in the move toward combatting climate change and being a healthier community. She felt it was time to make the issue mainstream. She questioned the process of assessing the LTS, whether it was plugging in numbers and determining a score or if counters were set up to really understand the actual traffic. She suggested discussing with neighborhood associations which streets residents avoid due to school traffic as a meaningful way to understand local issues.

Ms. Leahy responded that the map shows the quantitative data analysis using roadway characteristics and average daily traffic volumes that obscure higher-stress peak periods and Staff are working to supplement that with community input.

Council Member Kou agreed with involving neighborhood leaders who know the streets to provide important information. She felt in addition to more light, there needed to be education to inform people to wear reflective vests and have lights on bicycles. She questioned if the collision information was available on how the collision happened to understand the behaviors and help with education. Regarding the draft objectives of "comfortable and enjoyable," she believed it was not enjoyable for pedestrians to have cyclists come up behind them yelling to move. She stated the speed limit needed to be reconsidered.

Ms. Leahy noted the collision data was somewhat limited as it was taken through police reports and what the officer reporting on the scene observed or understood.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Member Tanaka believed the biggest thing keeping people from biking was safety. He described an initiative in Cambridge, Massachusetts, that every street has a protected bike lane by default unless it cannot and would love to see something like that in Palo Alto. He also suggested having fixed dollar amount subsidies for more affordable E-bikes rather than only very expensive ones, in order to be more conscious of socioeconomic differences of people in the City. He asked why bike shares have not happened even after a unanimous Council approval. He also questioned how El Camino fits into this.

Philip Kamhi, Chief Transportation Official, responded that there is a position available for someone to manage the bike share program that Staff is trying to hire for. There was a previous attempt to hire for that position, which was unsuccessful. He also noted that the El Camino work is under the Caltrans El Camino Ad Hoc and is not waiting for the bike plan.

Mayor Stone was also interested in the bike sharing program. He questioned if there was adequate bike parking available. On the collision data, he asked what is considered a severe injury. He also questioned if the decrease in collisions was a trend across other cities.

Chief Transportation Official Kamhi stated that in downtown, there seemed to be adequate bike parking facilities currently, and there will be more analysis to see if there are areas that could use additional bike parking. He believed the decrease in collisions was due to a confluence infrastructure improvements, decrease in traffic during COVID, and various other factors.

Ms. Leahy answered that the injury classifications were from the police reports and a severe injury was something that might result in a hospital visit.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims related her son's experience in which a driver opened a car door and her son biked into it and tumbled over. Since he was not injured, there was nothing reported. She believed the data was only the tip of the iceberg and that there must be many more incidents like that. She wondered if there was a way to notify someone of the data without an official report.

Council Member Kou was interested in what type of measures, such as helmets, might be implemented for more safety. She questioned if the notes from meetings with the Parks and Rec Commission and Planning and Transportation Commission were available, with more comments and detail than just the common themes.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Chief Transportation Official Kamhi responded that the review of comments and feedback from the Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee will be included in the report. He believed the Planning and Transportation Commission did meeting minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. Lucy L. wanted the City to rethink and engage with the school district. She felt making Churchill an underpass and forcing students to travel five blocks to get back to the school would increase bike traffic on Embarcadero Road where there is no bike path or protected bike lane. She suggested Churchill should be fully open to pedestrians and cars the way Charleston and East Meadow are.
2. Elizabeth A. explained that making streets safe for people to walk and bike actually makes them safe for people to drive as well. She suggested looking at specific origin-destination pairs to evaluate the travel times currently and how it would change if the network was changed in some way, also adding in the concept of the 15-minute city.
3. Liz G. (Zoom) spoke about the recent deadly accident of a bicyclist traveling west on California to cross El Camino Real and asked to include this intersection in these talks. She stated the report had a lack of perspective of pedestrians and cyclists dealing with truck traffic, noting the lack of oversight toward trucks traveling on roads that do not allow trucks.
4. Mark S. (Zoom) would like to see the next phase of the plan focus on how the City will promote more biking and walking. He thought the reports finding that accidents are going down was a reporting problem and not reality. He noted the ride from Santa Clara to Palo Alto was 18 miles on existing bike paths but only 8 miles back on El Camino and those distances matter to daily commuters. He wanted to see more attention paid to E-bikes and infrastructure in the plan and felt the intersection at North California and Alma next to the pedestrian bike tunnel needed to be looked at from a safety perspective.
5. Aram J. (Zoom) requested information on the cost to the City of this consulting firm. He also wanted information on the cost of all lawsuits filed against the City of Palo Alto over the past five years for bicycle-pedestrian accidents, including accidents in the park lands.

SUMMARY MINUTES

6. Eric N. (Zoom) suggested to consider, when prioritizing projects, how much improvement the project provides because the amount of money is almost always limited.
7. William C. suggested putting in speed bumps on Georgia Avenue adjacent to where the bicycle path meets the road in both directions as a simple way to slow cars down and reduce accidents. He stated he sees kids getting hit by cars on their bikes nearly every week and the incidents are almost never reported.
8. Penny E. felt the collision data would be more useful if it included trip counts or collision rates rather than collision counts given there were no school trips on the road during the pandemic. She noted an error in the report, stating that Wilke Bridge was not a walkway but a bicycle-pedestrian bridge carrying hundreds of bicycles every day. She spoke about the difficulty of biking on San Antonio Road.

NO ACTION

The Council took a five-minute break.

2. Review of Rail Grade Separation Alternatives for the advancement of the alternatives into the preliminary engineering and environmental documentation phase; CEQA status – statutorily exempt under CEQA section 15262 (feasibility and planning study).

Philip Kamhi, Chief Transportation Official, explained that the purpose of this Item was to review and discuss the efforts that have been completed to date concerning grade separation alternatives for Churchill, Meadow, and Charleston. The input will inform the Rail Committee and Council's consideration and decision on advancing specific alternatives into the preliminary engineering and environmental documentation phase.

Ripon Bhatia, Senior Engineer, described that for the Churchill Avenue crossing, a partial underpass was already selected as the local preferred alternative and for Meadow/Charleston, Council has narrowed down the alternatives to three options. He discussed engagement with Caltrain and evaluation of four-tracking segments. Caltrain has selected California Avenue Station for the four-tracking between Churchill Avenue and Meadow Drive. Caltrain provided additional technical review and reviewed all conceptual alternatives for these three grade crossings, identifying their concerns. Staff has worked with Caltrain to accommodate and address those elements in the alternatives. The partial underpass alternatives were refined to incorporate

SUMMARY MINUTES

feedback from stakeholders. Council had directed Staff to review the merits of Kellogg and Seale Avenue crossings as part of the partial underpass at Churchill Avenue. The analysis found that a bicycle and pedestrian crossing at Seale Avenue would fill a longer gap between alternative locations and would increase connectivity; however, it would also involve the use of park land at Peers Park. There are right-of-way constraints on the west side of the railroad tracks and potential impacts to the Palo Alto Unified School District stadium for the Kellogg Avenue location, and a drawback of the location is several turns cyclists and pedestrians need to make to traverse the crossing.

Robert Barnard, Caltrain Chief, Rail Design and Construction, explained Caltrain seeks to balance the needs of an operating railroad with the community. The team hoped to provide additional information to support effective decision-making to advance this project to the next level. Caltrain's focused review was on the right of way in the categories of safety, engineering, maintenance and operations, and policy and agreements. The team developed draft solutions based on the available planning level information. Mr. Barnard provided a high-level summary of the team's findings. For Churchill, it was found that a partial underpass at Kellogg was viable, with some refinements; the closure option with mitigations was moderately viable with modest encroachment and a ramp impacting Alma Street; and closure option 2 with mitigations was viable with no concerns.

Chief Transportation Official Kamhi discussed that the Rail Committee recommendations were to select Seale as the preferred bicycle and pedestrian crossing location and reconfirm the preference for a partial underpass for Churchill Avenue.

Council Member Burt shared that the Rail Committee had a lot of discussion on Churchill versus Seale and felt the Kellogg location was not viable. He explained the reasons for this, including the Kellogg location's impacts to PAUSD. The landing for the Seale option comes up in Peers Park and opens up the park for bike and ped access.

Council Member Veenker noted she supported the selection of Seale for the reasons Council Member Burt stated.

Mayor Stone wanted to clarify that no park land was required to be undedicated for this option. He asked how many trips are made daily to Paly using the current Churchill crossing. He stated he supported both of the plans.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Molly Stump, City Attorney, explained that traditionally bike and ped paths within parks have been approved through a park improvement ordinance as they are park features that improve access. She did not believe there was an undedication requirement but that would be revisited further as an actual project is identified.

Chief Transportation Official Kamhi later noted that bike and ped trip counts April 2023 showed 500 to 600 bicyclists and 870 or so pedestrians on Churchill daily, total, in both directions.

Council Member Burt discussed technologies available to show origin and destination information. He noted that Seale is the only street that goes all the way from Alma to Newell, creating a potentially valuable bike route out to Newell. As Caltrain came back with feedback on the initial 5% designs, there were a number of surprises on Caltrain's feedback that made the grade crossings more problematic and expensive than expected. A number of those have been resolved and some will be worked through in the next phase up to 15% engineering, such as improving bike and ped circulation and minimizing property impacts.

Vice Mayor Lauing pointed out there were a lot of meetings with Staff, Caltrain, and consultants to work out these issues, and he was pleased with where things were compared to where it started.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Study Session – Item 2: Churchill Avenue & Kellogg Vs Seale Avenue

1. Lucy L. strongly suggested, instead of building a wall, stopping all traffic from going across Alma. She requested the use of engineering skills to come up with a way to have the full underpass with the pedestrian and bicycle crossing at Churchill instead of spending more money to build a new tunnel at Seale that would not get used anywhere near as much.
2. Kat J-M (Zoom) asked that removing the 10-foot landscaping strip be reconsidered as it will create a safety issue for residents backing out of driveways onto Alma.
3. Liz G. (Zoom) was happy to see the alternative being narrowed down to a decision. She was grateful for Mr. Barnard's presentation. She was on the fence about the Churchill partial underpass and did not think blocking direct access to pedestrians and bicyclists would solve many problems and may create more challenges.

SUMMARY MINUTES

4. Eric N. (Zoom) felt that if low-stress crossing options during construction were not available for students and commuters, many bicyclists and pedestrians may choose to drive, worsening congestion. He stated it was important to build new bike-ped crossings before the existing crossings become construction zones.
5. Penny E. hoped Staff would help organize all of the information with a matrix. She also thought the cost estimates looked extremely out of date and wanted to understand the effects on the budget.
6. Deborah G. (Zoom) stated she did not see any crossings in South Palo Alto. She noted the crossing at Seale would destroy the dog park at Peers Park and there would be a need for another centrally located dog park. She felt it was optimistic that students would go through Seale and that they needed the Kellogg undercrossing.
7. Cedric (Zoom) echoed Penny's comment that the information was hard to find, in particular the information on property impacts of each option. He also supported building the bike-ped crossings before turning the existing crossings into construction zones.

Council Member Burt explained the partial underpass design for Churchill itself has not changed considerably from five years ago but previously when a full undercrossing was being considered, there were far more property impacts on Churchill and Alma. The minimal impact on properties was one of the reasons the partial underpass was selected along with the traffic studies showing the primary turning movements of cars being met with this option. The Rail Committee fully embraces bike and ped crossings being created prior to the vehicular ones, with a particular emphasis on the proposed crossing in the vicinity of Loma Verde.

Chief Transportation Official Kamhi presented maps showing the property impacts for the Kellogg and Seale alternatives, with the crossing at Kellogg requiring more partial acquisitions.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims asked if there was a slide showing the comparative property acquisitions for the full underpass alternative.

Chief Transportation Official Kamhi noted there was no slide available for the full underpass but there was high-level work done on that.

Nadia Naik explained that the property impacts would have been incredibly significant with the full underpass, cutting off not just the access to the homes along the road but the set back homes as well. Additionally, the traffic studies showed the main use of Alma at the Churchill intersection was

SUMMARY MINUTES

cars turning north and south onto Alma. She gave more detail on the bike-pedestrian patterns.

Council Member Kou asked where the bicyclists and pedestrians cross on the north side of Churchill. She also asked for confirmation on the removal of the 10-foot planting strip mentioned in public comment.

Chief Transportation Official Kamhi responded that bikes and pedestrians would either cross at Embarcadero or, if selected as the preferred location, Seale. He also noted that a vehicular cyclist could actually navigate through the underpass, which would be a high level of stress.

Senior Engineer Ripon Bhatia responded that Rail Committee proposed a buffer zone of 5 feet for landscaping and another 5 feet for the sidewalk, providing 10 feet of buffer between the curb and driveway, but that requires a partial acquisition from all those properties.

The discussion continued on to Meadow and Charleston.

Senior Engineer Ripon Bhatia explained that feedback was taken from various stakeholders and incorporated into the refined partial underpass designs for Meadow and Charleston. There were community requests to review the viaduct alternative. Caltrain reviewed the viaduct and shared their results and recommendations on improvements that would be needed. The Rail Committee preferred the hybrid and underpass alternatives, and viaduct was no longer in consideration by the Rail Committee.

Mr. Barnard explained there is a jog in the right-of-way at Meadow Drive that is material to where the tracks are and influences where other things are located. Caltrain found the hybrid solution was viable with some refinements. The temporary shoofly would impact Alma and take about a 12-foot travel lane during construction but still leave 4 travel lanes available. The viaduct option would push out into Alma Street, taking about two travel lanes for not only the viaduct but also the viaduct approach structures, which would be permanently in Alma Street. The underpass was found to be viable with modest accommodations.

Chief Transportation Official Kamhi presented the property impacts for the Meadow Drive underpass alternative and the Charleston Road underpass alternative on the east and west sides, which include some tentative full property acquisitions. He reviewed the Rail Committee recommendation, a 2-to-1 vote for the underpass alternative and hybrid alternative at Meadow Drive and Charleston Road as the preferred options to be advanced to the City Council for preliminary engineering review. The Rail Committee also recommended seeking ways to reduce property impacts; to optimize the

SUMMARY MINUTES

bike and pedestrian crossings and, where feasible, improve connection to bike infrastructure beyond the study to improve the network; to further refine the traffic circle on Charleston Road to reduce property impacts; and to refine construction impacts to better understand mutations needed during the lengthy construction process.

Council Member Burt explained that based on big transportation projects in the region, it was assumed the costs would be at least 50% higher, but that will not be known until the next phase of engineering. Previously the consultants did not have an indication that jack box construction, which greatly reduces the time of construction and potentially has significant cost decreases, would be permitted, but Caltrain's Corridor Crossing Strategy now embraces jack box construction where applicable. Regarding the need for grade separations, he noted that even with commuter trips reduced and gate downtimes not as much as expected, increasing housing means there will likely be a lot more people in the community embracing transit and biking. Safety and security of the tracks is a big issue in the community, and grade separations can do a great deal for that. He also asked Staff to review the reason this item is at a decision point at this meeting.

Chief Transportation Official Kamhi explained the City has been awarded 2 grants for close to \$8M per location and needs to enter a funding agreement for the next phase, which requires the preferred alternatives to be selected.

Council Member Burt added for context that future funding is also in jeopardy if the preferred alternatives are not chosen by June.

Council Member Kou, regarding the trench option being cost prohibitive, felt this was an investment that would last many years. She thought High-Speed Rail should make a determination now about whether it will come through here and believed money from High-Speed Rail should be invested into this project. She was against any option that required full property acquisitions.

Council Member Tanaka agreed with Council Member Kou that the trench deserved a closer look. He also felt there would be litigation involved with property acquisitions that would be very expensive and take a lot of time, so factoring that in, he wanted to look at the trench as a viable option.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims asked Staff to explain how the turning movements would change with the roundabout in the Charleston Road underpass alternative and the U-turn at Alma Village on the Meadow alternative, which would require a traffic light and would potentially back up Alma. She asked about the impact at commute time.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Chief Transportation Official Kamhi explained that because Charleston is depressed in an underpass going under the rail, the turning movements would not be available for somebody to make a left turn onto Charleston. To make that movement, one would need to go the right on Charleston and use the traffic circle.

Senior Engineer Bhatia added that the three movements affected by this underpass were southbound right, northbound left, and eastbound left because of the bike and ped path on the north side on a different elevation than the roadway. Since the movements cannot be made at the intersection, one will have to go through the roundabout. He explained a similar issue on Meadow. The south side is utilized for bike and ped pathway to minimize impact to the residential driveways. The difference in grades does not allow any movements that go toward the south side on Alma Street at that location. The northbound right would have to use Alma Village to make a U-turn and then go onto the off ramp in the southbound direction to go onto Meadow Drive. Eastbound Meadow Drive traffic will not be able to access northbound Alma and would have to use a different street to get to Alma Street. He noted the traffic study took those turning movements and signal timing into account, and off ramps were looked at to allow for the additional turning movements.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims noted she was the Rail Committee member who voted against this. She believed most members of the community did not know this would be a lengthy construction project with a lot of backups and delays, fundamentally altering traffic patterns. She was interested in making the least impact on private property and the character of the City. She accepted none of the options would please everybody but hoped to end up with an option that felt visionary and in service to what is right decades out, not just today.

Council Member Veenker stated there were no perfect solutions and this was very hard. She noted there was a lot to like about the hybrid option and asked if it was possible to ballpark the cost of having it built on stanchions like a viaduct.

Chief Transportation Official Kamhi stated the option for stanchions could be evaluated further if the hybrid option was selected.

Vice Mayor Lauing noted the one thing worse than all the alternatives was no project. He explained that the Rail Committee had listed for further consideration to reduce property impacts, optimize bike-pedestrian crossings, and further refine the traffic circle on Charleston, hoping there are solutions to these with further engineering. He discussed the reconsideration

SUMMARY MINUTES

of the viaduct by the Rail Committee and the costs of the trench option, originally estimated at \$800M to \$950M and currently estimated to be 50% more. He did not want to open the trench as an option relative to funding and the other alternatives.

Council Member Kou felt there should be a line item included for the cost of property acquisitions and potential related lawsuits.

Chief Transportation Official Kamhi clarified that the line item for right-of-way and utilities was meant to capture those costs.

Council Member Burt added some context to the discussion regarding the trench option. For a viaduct or underpass, it did not impact the cost that someday Caltrain may need to put four tracks there. However, it is not possible to build a two-track trench and come back and do a four-track trench. Allowing for the four-track would cause costs to go up by 50% or more, plus significant increased cost from a design standpoint, meaning the trench would unlikely be less than \$1.5B. The funding sources will not pay for the difference in cost between that and other alternatives. It is not possible to come up with another \$1B. There is an impact to community quality of life in not doing anything or continuing to look for an ideal solution regardless of price when the dollars are not available. He noted it was possible to choose an option and a backup, though there would be additional cost involved. He also discussed how the traffic is impacted by all of the options. The traffic studies show that the hybrid, viaduct, or even trench had traffic signals at Alma backed up and the only option that significantly improves the traffic is the underpass.

Council Member Burt added that one of the main reasons people were advocates for the viaduct was the idea of having a linear park, but unfortunately Caltrain must retain the surface rail even with the viaduct and there is no option for a linear park. He discussed that this type of transportation project almost invariably has property impacts. He felt there should be a presentation about those impacts to the full Council prior to coming back with this in June.

Mayor Stone asked why the viaduct is so much more expensive than the hybrid option. He then stated he agreed with the Rail Committee recommendations to advance the two preferred alternatives.

Peter DeStefano, Senior Transportation Engineer at AECOM, responded that most of the cost is coming from the structure itself. A lot of the cost is below ground in the columns and foundations.

SUMMARY MINUTES

PUBLIC COMMENT: Study Session – Item 2: Meadow Drive & Charleston Road

1. Steve E. believed this project was a big deal and worth spending the time to get it right. He noted his preferred option was the viaduct but asked to at least make the hybrid have no dirt berms.
2. Elizabeth A. stated she was the person who brought forth the underpass and was willing to spend time explaining why they work. She explained that the necessity of every requirement must be questioned and that the definition of the project is critical. She also felt the process needed to include more than just engineers.
3. Ron P. felt that in addition to the negative impacts to properties, the underpass was still a flawed solution with convoluted traffic patterns. He stated there was a lot of discussion about the underpass but not much about the hybrid and hoped that did not reflect the thinking.
4. Aram J. (Zoom) wanted to know the cost of all consultants hired by the City to give information on the grade separations.
5. Michael W. (Zoom) was concerned around the Charleston roundabout. He suggested moving bike and ped traffic exclusively to East Meadow if the current plan prevents certain Charleston/Alma turn patterns. He felt the inconvenience of homeowners of other residential roads could not supersede the impacts to the residents on Charleston by the traffic circle.
6. Linda (Zoom), owner of a property on Charleston Road, asked the City to consider any other options that will not take away residents' properties.
7. David N. (Zoom) agreed with Linda and shared the story of his mother who is a resident of Charleston Road and does not want to lose her home.
8. Eric N. (Zoom) asked the Council to consider the hybrid plan as it has minimal acquisitions of property and is four times cheaper than the trench.
9. Patrice B. (Zoom), a resident of Charleston, felt that property acquisition was a robbery and not a negotiation. She listed the Council's priorities, including belonging, stating those residents wish to belong and not be forced out. She urged the Council to figure out how to move the traffic and keep the families.

SUMMARY MINUTES

10. Liz G. (Zoom) supported this decision and urged the Council to go forward and take advantage of the grant money available.
11. Michael B. (Zoom) believed this should go into a public vote and not be decided by City Council. He stated people will not be using cars the same way in 30 years from now and felt that people living in Palo Alto should come first.
12. Bryan C. (Zoom) encouraged looking at alternatives that mitigate the noise and vibrations caused by the trains, which will directly improve everyone's daily life.
13. Lu L. (Zoom), a resident of Charleston, asked the City to look at the viaduct option again considering it takes the shortest amount of time, was not nearly as expensive as other options, and had less property effects.
14. Cedric (Zoom) hoped the trench would not be further considered and felt the viaduct was the best option for cyclists and people with mobility issues, also having the least vibrational impact. He noted the underpass had many issues for all modes plus the property takings. He did not believe residents on Park would support the hybrid over the viaduct because of design concerns.
15. Penny E. thought there needed to be a package with renderings and further engineering to help the community understand the projects.

Chief Transportation Official Kamhi reviewed the next steps, including returning to Council on June 10 for consideration of selecting preferred alternatives.

Council Member Burt supported renderings to help the public visualize the options. He also felt it would help to have not just numbers of properties impacted but percentages by the underpass and hybrid and added that the engineering design going forward would further optimize that.

NO ACTION

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 P.M.