

Meeting Agenda
Council Subcommittee – High Speed Rail

Date: December 6, 2010

Time: 5:30 to 6:30 PM

Location: City Council Conference Room

Notes:

	Agenda Topic	Who	Desired Outcome
1.	Agenda review – make adjustment as needed	Kent	Group understands and agrees on agenda
2.	Review preliminary list of ideas for legislative advocacy (Attachment). Discuss these or other ideas.	Kent	Agree on priorities that can be communicated back to Ravi
3.	Review draft “open letter on High Speed Rail” distributed at the last PCC meeting for consideration (Attachment)	Kent	Discuss potential next steps
4.	Next PCC Meeting (Friday, December 10th, 8:15am, Palo Alto) – Confirm Agenda	Rich/Starla	Be Prepared for PCC meeting.
5.	Report out – what should be reported at the next Council meeting?	All	Agree on content for next Council update

Future Meeting Topics:

HIGH SPEED RAIL LEGISLATIVE IDEAS

- 1. Require the Peer Review Committee to review all engineering and related design work done by CHSRA and its consultants, and ensure this information is available to the public at all times.**
- 2. Provide adequate and sustained funding for the Peer Review Committee.**
- 3. Establish that the Peer Review Committee is subject to the Brown Act.**
- 4. Require CHSRA to reimburse communities for their costs associated with reviewing the work done by CHSRA professional consultants.**
- 5. Require CHSRA to contract with UCITS to do a new ridership study.**
- 6. Increase the number of Board members on CHSRA, provide for Board member qualifications (engineer, financial expert, geographic representation, prohibition of any individual who serves on a local Transportation Authority, or is an elected/appointed/government official of any community affected by HSR, etc) and require Senate approval of all CHSRA Board members.**
- 7. Require that all CHSRA Board members, staff, and consultants are subject to the provisions of the California Conflict of Interest Code, and that all of the above are prohibited from receiving any gifts. Additionally, require that any gifts made to the CHSRA shall not be accepted without consent from the Senate, and any such gift to the Authority shall not be allocated to anyone without the advice and consent of the Senate.**
- 8. Require that CHSRA Board members, staff and consultants shall not represent any interest before the Authority for a period of three years after leaving the employ or termination of the consulting services.**
- 9. Require that the Authority use the Altamont Pass.**
- 10. Consider a bill to require an open cut and covered trench/tunnel for HSR in PA**
- 11. Consider a bill to allocate a portion of the Proposition 1A bond funds for cut and cover/trench or tunnel design for HSR in CA. Alternatively, consider a bill to place on the Ballot a Constitutional amendment for additional funding for such purposes and to assist cities with the local impacts associated with HSR.**
- 12. Consider a bill to provide historic status to PA University Avenue Caltrain station if this is not already in place.**

Jerry Nagel
11-19-10

AN OPEN LETTER ON HIGH SPEED RAIL

To: Governor-Elect Jerry Brown, State Legislators and Roelof van Ark, CEO, California High Speed Rail Authority

Subject: Resetting the planning process for Caltrain and the high speed rail project on the San Francisco Peninsula

Our city is committed to working collaboratively to build better transportation solutions on the San Francisco Peninsula. We understand the desirability for cities on the Peninsula to reach general agreement on a transportation vision that will guide the Peninsula into the future.

By working together, we will have greater influence on how to improve both Caltrain and high speed rail. We will attract more federal and state funding, as well as private investment, when we agree upon the plan we have for transportation in our respective communities.

Now that preliminary high speed rail funding has been designated for the Central Valley, we have the time to complete the planning process the right way.

Our city requests:

1. An independent ridership study, which is essential to inform the scope of the design alternatives. For example, it may dictate whether we need two tracks or four tracks in some areas – options that have tremendous cost and design ramifications. This analysis is vital and we ask for it to be completed as quickly as possible.
2. An independent review of the budget and business plan for high speed rail in California. Planning for this project must be grounded in reality.
3. An informed discussion among all relevant parties about the freight issues and opportunities on the Peninsula. Freight has environmental benefits for our communities, but there are design constraints that need to be resolved. We want an open dialogue directly with the freight operators and freight customers to develop solutions and build a consensus along the corridor.
4. Restoration of the alignments that our city prefers most in the Alternatives Analysis. If our desired alternatives are excluded from the Alternatives Analysis, there is no real opportunity for creative problem solving around both design and funding.
5. A more thorough vetting of alternatives, with adequate analysis of impacts, before the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) goes forward. There must be agreement between our city and the California High Speed Rail Authority on the final alternatives that are studied in the Draft EIR. There is no need to rush completion of the EIR, only to have it sit on a shelf and become stale. This document should be a viable plan that has the full support of our city.

We understand that other Peninsula cities may be expressing common recommendations.