

CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY

BOARD MEETING

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

HOLIDAY INN BURBANK-MEDIA CENTER

GRAND BALLROOM

150 E. ANGELENO AVENUE

BURBANK, CA 91502

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2018

10:00 A.M.

Reported by:
Martha Nelson

APPEARANCESBOARD MEMBERS

Dan Richard, Chairman

Tom Richards, Vice Chair

Lynn Schenk

Michael Rossi

Daniel Curtin (Absent)

Nancy Miller

Bonnie Lowenthal (Absent)

Ernest Camacho

EX OFFICIO BOARD MEMBERS

Assemblymember, Dr. Joaquin Arambula (Absent)

Senator, Jim Beall (Absent)

STAFF

Joseph Hedges, Chief Operating Officer

Michelle Boehm, Southern California Director

Juan Carlos Velasquez, Project Manager

Mark Mcloughlin, Director of Environmental Services

Melissa De La Peña, Program Manager

Jim Andrew, Assistant Chief Counsel

Tom Fellenz, Chief Counsel

APPEARANCES (Cont.)

STAFF (Cont.)

Doug Drozd, Chief of Board Management

PRESENTERS:

Michelle Boehm, Southern California Director

Juan Carlos Velasquez, Project Manager

Mark Mcloughlin, Director of Environmental Services

Melissa De La Peña, Program Manager

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Marsha Mclean, Mayor Pro Tem, City Of Santa Clarita

Mike Aguilera for Congressman Adam Schiff

Arturo Garcia for Assembly Member Luz Rivas

Jason Manca for L.A. County Supervisor Kathryn Barger

Jessica Orellana for L.A. Country Supervisor Sheila Kuehl

Brandon Araujo, City Of Vernon

Arcelia Arce for L.A. City Councilwoman Nury Martinez

Eveline Bravo-Ayala for Senator Robert M. Hertzberg

Mike Behen, City Of Palmdale

Noe Negrete, City Of Santa Fe Springs, Gateway Cities COG

APPEARANCES (Cont.)PUBLIC COMMENT: (Cont.)

Lawrence King, Acton-Agua Dulce USD

Judi Trujillo, Self

Darrell Clarke, Sierra Club

Kathleen Trinity, Self

Marlene Fawkes, Self

Russ Fawkes, Self

Christopher Darga, Self

Steve Correa, Self

Cindy Sower, Sun Valley Area Neighborhood Council

Susan Lustig, Self

Jean Laird, Self

Pamela Walter, Self

Ruth Brock, Acton Town Council

Michael O'Gara, Self

Renee Renfro, Self

Janet Gibson, Self

Josh Hertz, Atwater Village Neighborhood Council

Charles Follette, Self

Janet Lammon

Jacqueline Ayer, SAVE OUR RURAL TOWN

APPEARANCES (Cont.)PUBLIC COMMENT: (Cont.)

Kelly Teno, Acton Town Council

Lorraine Diaz, L.A. City Councilmember Paul Krekorian

Barbara Harris, Self

Nancy Crosby, Self

Pat Kramer, Self

Dale Bybee, Self

Gary Agius, Self

Katherine Paul, Self

Susan Stedman, Self

Dave DePinto, Self

Cindy Bloom, Self

Gerri Summe, Self

Dale Stedman, Self

Liliana Sanchez, Self

Kelly Decker, Self

Lynne Toby, Self

Dana Stangel, Sunland-Tujunga Neighborhood Council

Elijah Wells, Lake View Terrace Improvement Association

Charlie Bradley, Sunland-Tujunga Neighborhood Council

Penelope McMillan, Self

APPEARANCES (Cont.)PUBLIC COMMENT: (Cont.)

Thomas Dorsey, Self

Mark Wilcher, Mountain Glen II Homeowners Association

Maria Elena Rico, Self

Rebecca Colfer, Self

Angelike Martin, Self

Daniel Beltran, Self

Dylan Lunde, Acton Town Council

John Spanos, Self

John Laue, Self

<u>INDEX</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
	Roll Call	9
1.	Staff Presentation on the Recommended State Preferred Alternative for the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS)	12
2.	Staff Presentation on the Recommended State Preferred Alternative for the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section Draft EIR/EIS	27
3.	Staff Presentation on the Recommended State Preferred Alternative for the Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Draft EIR/EIS	35
	<u>Public Comment</u>	46
4.	Consider Concurring with the Staff Recommended State Preferred Alternative for Identification in the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section Draft EIR/EIS	158
5.	Consider Concurring with the Staff Recommended State Preferred Alternative for Identification in the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section Draft EIR/EIS	159
6.	Consider Concurring with the Staff Recommended State Preferred Alternative for Inclusion in the Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Draft EIR/EIS	160

INDEX

	<u>PAGE</u>
7. Consider Approving the Board Meeting Minutes from the October 16, 2018 Board Meeting	160
8. Closed Session Pertaining to Litigation	161
Adjourned	161

P R O C E E D I N G S

10:00 a.m.

PROCEEDINGS BEGIN AT 10:00 A.M.

BURBANK, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2018

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Excuse me, if I could ask people to take their seats please? Good morning everyone. It's a beautiful day here in the San Fernando Valley and this meeting of the High-Speed Rail Authority will come to order.

Will the Secretary please call the roll?

MR. DROZD: Director Schenk?

BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Here.

MR. DROZD: Vice Chair Richards?

VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Here.

MR. DROZD: Director Rossi?

BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Here.

MR. DROZD: Director Curtin?

BOARD MEMBER CURTIN: (Absent).

MR. DROZD: Director Lowenthal?

BOARD MEMBER LOWENTHAL: (Absent).

MR. DROZD: Director Camacho?

BOARD MEMBER CAMACHO: Here.

MR. DROZD: Director Miller?

BOARD MEMBER MILLER: Here.

MR. DROZD: Senator Beall?

1 EX OFFICIO BOARD MEMBER BEALL: (Absent).

2 MR. DROZD: Assemblymember Arambula?

3 EX OFFICIO BOARD MEMBER ARAMBULA: (Absent).

4 MR. DROZD: Chair Richard

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I'm here. Please join me in
6 the Pledge of Allegiance.

7 (The Pledge of Allegiance is made.)

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Before we start this morning,
9 I'd like to just take a moment. This has been an extremely
10 difficult and challenging week for citizens across the
11 state. We've had this scourge of wildfires and the scourge
12 of gun violence. And we've seen a terrible tragedy here in
13 the southland with a just unfathomable killing of 12
14 people, including a peace officer sworn to protect us. As
15 we sit here this morning 56 lives have been confirmed lost
16 in the fires in Northern California in Butte County; 3 more
17 here in Southern California to the Woolsey Fire. And I
18 think it's just appropriate to take a moment to reflect,
19 express our gratitude to the men and women on the fire
20 lines who are doing everything to keep us safe at great
21 personal risk. And if I could ask everybody to just
22 silence your cell phones for a moment. Let's stand and
23 have a moment of silent reflection.

24 (A moment of silence is held.)

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

1 On our agenda this morning is the consideration
2 of three different staff proposals to identify a preferred
3 set of alignments through the Southern California region
4 for the High-Speed Rail line. And what I want to do in
5 terms of how this meeting will be conducted today, it would
6 be similar to what we've done in other communities when we
7 have made these kinds of decisions. So when we get to the
8 point of making decisions that affect alignments we do that
9 first and foremost in the communities where those decisions
10 could have the most impact on people, to give people an
11 opportunity to come before us and express their views.

12 Now normally, for those of you who follow our
13 High-Speed Rail meetings, we begin each meeting with public
14 comment. But our practice is, whenever we are making
15 decisions about route alignments, the first thing we do is
16 we ask the staff to make a presentation, so that the
17 members of the public can be fully informed about what it
18 is the staff is proposing. Even though these materials
19 have been available to the public and have been online, it
20 seems to us that it enhances public participation to hear
21 first from the staff about what the specific proposals are.
22 Then, after those staff presentations, we will have public
23 comment. And we will take those comments in the order in
24 which they are delivered to us, with the exception that we
25 give elected officials and representatives the first call

1 on that.

2 I also want to make sure that everybody
3 understands that while this is a very important set of
4 decisions today, in the process of picking a route, it is
5 not by any means a final decision. Under the environmental
6 review laws and procedures and practices, we can -- if you
7 think about a funnel -- we can take a large number of
8 possible options and the staff can propose to us that one
9 of those options become a preferred alternate for further
10 environmental analysis.

11 While that does give you an indication of where
12 the staff is thinking that the Board should go and our
13 agreement with that, if my colleagues do agree, it does not
14 mean the end of the process. There has to be further
15 environmental work. There may be some showstoppers that
16 come up as part of that environmental work. So I just
17 wanted to try to give everybody the context to help you
18 participate with us this morning as we go forward.

19 So with that, I'm going to turn to our Acting
20 CEO, Mr. Hedges to introduce the staff presentation.

21 MR. HEDGES: Good Morning. I want to thank the
22 staff for all their hard work. I also wanted to thank the
23 community for all their input. And with that I would like
24 to kick it off, what basically is to make a presentation
25 with regards to the Palmdale to Burbank Alignment, so will

1 Michelle, Mark and Jose, please. Thank you.

2 MS. BOEHM: Good morning. Thank you for coming
3 to Southern California. We are pleased to be having this
4 Board Meeting here and we are pleased to be able to make a
5 presentation on the very important milestones that we are
6 talking about for three of our project sections this
7 morning. We are making a similar presentation, similar
8 content and we are at a similar milestone for each of the
9 three projects that we will be talking about. So as we
10 move forward, I'd just like to remind you of that and make
11 you aware. So there will be similar conversation about all
12 three of these projects.

13 I am Michelle Boehm. I am the Southern
14 California Regional Director. And again, I'd like to
15 welcome our Board to Southern California and to the San
16 Fernando Valley. I would like to have you close your eyes
17 and think about the future. Think about 2040. In
18 2040, over 35,000 people will board a High-Speed Rail train
19 in a station somewhere within L.A. County, pretty cool. We
20 are here to take a step towards that, again a milestone,
21 not a final decision.

22 So I would like to ask the Board today to concur
23 with the staff recommendation to identify Refined SR14 as
24 the State's Preferred Alternative. This is a
25 recommendation that is based on preliminary analysis and is

1 considered a preliminary recommendation.

2 We will continue to analyze all alternatives at a
3 similar level of detail, as we move through the process.
4 The comments that we receive continue to be considered up
5 until the certification of the final environmental
6 documents. Coordination with resource agencies and
7 stakeholders on key issues continues. That conversation
8 about what we're doing continues. And the processes may
9 lead to modifications. So we're here today to tell you
10 what we know today. But as we move through the process
11 those things can be further refined.

12 So let's talk about Palmdale to Burbank. We have
13 been studying three alternatives over the course of the
14 last several years. You can see those here on the map, the
15 Refined SR14, E1 and E2. This makes a critical connection
16 between the Antelope Valley and the Los Angeles Basin,
17 taking a trip that today could take over two hours in
18 traffic and delivering people from one end to the other in
19 20 minutes or less.

20 These routes that we've been studying are between
21 33 and 38 miles long. There are two stations at each end
22 as with all of our project sections.

23 And we have thoroughly studied lots of different
24 ways to make this connection, because it is a very
25 important connection. And those started back in 2005, with

1 the Program EIR/EIS. We have subsequently produced several
2 alternative analysis documents, even up to and including
3 amending the scoping in 2014, so that we could better focus
4 our resources on studying Palmdale to Burbank, which is a
5 mountain crossing. And then Burbank to LA, which is an
6 urban running corridor.

7 And subsequent to that then we refined this
8 project even further to get to the three alternatives that
9 we are studying today. And that project manager, Juan
10 Carlos Velasquez will tell you a little bit more in a
11 minute.

12 And so here is our journey from 2010 to 2016. A
13 lot of things to consider as we take a look at making that
14 best connection and as we understand and learn more about
15 our communities and the community concerns. And these are
16 the changes this project evolves as we get science and as
17 we understand how to better integrate it within to a
18 community.

19 Here is a summary of our public outreach over the
20 course of the last several years. Here is a very important
21 concept that we have always employed as we do this project,
22 which is it is a balance. It is a balance of the project
23 objectives and the things that we need to achieve. We need
24 to build an all-electric, renewable energy-based connection
25 north to south in the State of California that is safe. We

1 need to protect environmental resources. And we need to
2 protect our communities. And so all of our efforts to date
3 have been striking that balance with our routes and we've
4 had successes. And we still have conversations moving
5 forward to the final decision point.

6 Today, we are recommending to the Board that the
7 Refined SR14 be designated as the State's Preferred
8 Alternative for inclusion in the draft environmental
9 documents that will be released later on. And the reason
10 that we are recommending it is because it has the lowest
11 risk during construction. It has the fewest traffic and
12 air quality impacts within the communities. It will
13 generate the least amount of spoils from tunneling. It has
14 the shortest tunnel underneath the designated national
15 monument. It has the lowest risk of affecting surface or
16 groundwater. And it avoids other key environmental and
17 cultural resources that we want to protect. And oh, by the
18 way, from where we started with the old SR14 it's faster,
19 because it's shorter.

20 And here are some of the things that we have been
21 able to do with these routes as we've moved through. And
22 again, these are some of our successes and some of our
23 successes are still to come as we continue the
24 conversation. In Palmdale, of course, we're looking at a
25 multi-modal station that potentially has a connection

1 someday to Las Vegas. Through Acton and Agua Dulce, we
2 have to look very carefully at the geography and the unique
3 character of those communities; Soledad Canyon, Santa
4 Clarita, looking at some of these growing areas of Los
5 Angeles and the natural areas that they're looking at for
6 recreation; and then coming in to the San Fernando Valley
7 with Sylmar, San Fernando, Pacoima and Sun Valley, looking
8 at those communities and finding a way to protect them over
9 where we started. And finally ending at the Hollywood
10 Burbank Airport where they are working on a very important
11 project and we are coordinating closely with them to make
12 sure that their project is successful as well.

13 So with that, I'll turn it over to Juan Carlos
14 Velasquez to take you mile-post by mile-post through the
15 section.

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good morning.

17 MR. VELASQUEZ: Thank you. Good morning Mr.
18 Chair and Members of the Board. I'm just going to walk
19 through the Alignment, some details about the Preferred
20 Alternative Recommendation and also how it's different from
21 the other routes.

22 So here you see a map and some description about
23 the Alignment. One point about the map, the color coding,
24 the red that you see there, that indicates that it would be
25 underground in a tunnel configuration. Where it's green,

1 it's on the surface. And where it's blue, it's on a bridge
2 or aerial structure.

3 So there you'll see some information about the
4 route as it goes from Palmdale roughly paralleling the 14
5 Freeway through the forest or under the forest rather and
6 into the San Fernando Valley, with a series of tunnels, the
7 longest is about 13 miles or so.

8 Here is a comparison of the routes that we've
9 been studying, the Refined SR14, E1 and E2. And you can
10 see the difference in total length 33 to 38 miles, as
11 Michelle mentioned earlier. The Refined SR14 as built is
12 the longest of the three. And then you can see the
13 breakdown between surface, elevated and underground as well
14 as the difference in travel time, which is not a
15 significant difference there.

16 A difference, this summarizes the project costs.
17 You can see there, the range between 18 and 20 billion,
18 between the three alternatives, so well within about 10
19 percent range. So there's not a significant difference
20 there.

21 A couple of comments to clarification on the
22 costs; the costs for the environmental documents is
23 approached differently than what we do for the Business
24 Plan. A couple of key points about that; when we look at
25 the project sections we look at them as demonstrating

1 independent utility. In other words, clearing and
2 developing a project between Palmdale and Burbank in an
3 independent manner. So there is a lot of duplication for
4 the next section to the south, for example, would also
5 include the Burbank Station, the maintenance facilities and
6 things. So there's a lot of overlap when we look at the
7 project we're looking at them as independent. So they're
8 not meant to be added together.

9 And also when we're looking at the environmental
10 studies, we're looking at the maximum footprint that we
11 want to evaluate for potential impacts. So again, this is
12 a conservative approach based on the design that we have at
13 the time. So we're not yet applying value engineering or
14 mitigation or other things that would be done to refine the
15 cost, so the approach is different. They're not meant to
16 be the same.

17 So just as we walk through the alignment from
18 north to south starting in Palmdale, all of the alignments
19 in Palmdale are a common alignment: the SR14, E1, E2. They
20 all use the Palmdale Transportation Center as a station
21 that would be co-located with Metrolink. It would also
22 accommodate the future high-speed train connection to Las
23 Vegas.

24 As we move south from there the alignments split
25 off. The Refined SR14 is the one at the upper left. And

1 that roughly follows the SR14 Corridor. As I mentioned, it
2 goes through Acton primarily an underground configuration
3 through those hills there. There is a short portion as we
4 cross over the 14 Freeway that is aboveground. There is a
5 high school nearby there, but we are farther from the high
6 school than the freeway is. We're on the other side of
7 that. And as it goes through the roughly paralleling that
8 section through the 14, we have a series of bridges and
9 tunnels. So it allows for a lot of crossing for wildlife,
10 which is a consideration.

11 The E1, E2 Alignments are the ones on the right.
12 And they're a singular alignment there for the northern
13 part of that. And they enter into the longer tunnel
14 sooner. You can see the green-shaded area is where the
15 boundary of the Angeles National Forrest. So those lines
16 start a tunnel near the Aliso Canyon Road.

17 In the middle section, through the forest, the
18 Refined SR14 again is all within a tunnel. It crosses near
19 Santa Clarita. There's a short portion that we go
20 underneath there and tunnel several hundred feet. The
21 northern portal of that long tunnel is at a former mining
22 site that we would use for our construction and then
23 potential restoration of that site with all the materials
24 coming out of the tunnel.

25 The E1, E2 Alignments also, both of those are all

1 within tunnel through the Angeles National Forest and the
2 Monument. And all alignments we've allowed for potential
3 intermediate access point for construction. And that would
4 be in privately-held lands.

5 As we come into the San Fernando Valley, the
6 Refined SR14 and E1 Alignment combine into a singular
7 alignment there. We are coming into the San Fernando
8 Valley much farther south than previously to avoid a lot of
9 the more developed areas to the northeast of the San
10 Fernando Valley. As we approach the San Fernando Valley
11 area and come out of the tunnel we join the existing
12 Metrolink Corridor and follow that along the surface for
13 some portion and then eventually in a trench and then a
14 tunnel as we approach the Burbank Airport.

15 The E2 avoids this area. And that's the
16 alignment on the right. Instead that one continues on the
17 tunnel until it reaches the community of Lake View Terrace
18 where it crosses the Tujunga Wash in an area where there
19 are electrical transmission corridors that cross the wash
20 as well. And then that goes back into a tunnel under
21 Shadow Hills.

22 And then finally all the alignments combine and
23 come into a singular alignment again at the Burbank Airport
24 Station where we would be located next to where the
25 Hollywood Burbank Airport is planning a replacement

1 terminal. One note about that though is we are separate.
2 The projects are independent and we would avoid surface
3 impacts to their layout plan. And again, we would be in an
4 underground configuration that's shown there, because we're
5 proposing to cross the runways there.

6 So with that Mark McLoughlin, our Director of
7 Environmental Services, will talk about the remaining steps
8 here.

9 MR. MCLOUGHLIN: Good morning chairman and Board
10 Members. Mark McLoughlin. I'm the Director of
11 Environmental Services for the Authority. I'm going to
12 kind of walk through to end up the presentation on the
13 technical pieces of the approach and the process.

14 So for identifying the State's Preferred
15 Alternative it's important to know that the Draft EIR/EIS
16 is aligning with federal laws and state laws including Map-
17 21 and the recent adoption FAST Act, and including CEQA in
18 the state context.

19 This process is consistent with the approach
20 we've done previously for the Fresno to Bakersfield LGA and
21 recently Bakersfield to Palmdale, at last month's Board
22 Meeting. So what we do when we identify this Preferred
23 Alternative is it allows the public and also state and
24 federal agencies to take a look at the document in the
25 context of the Preferred Alternative that we're proposing

1 so if there is a comment period and people can understand
2 what the Preferred Alternative means too, as we go through
3 the process of the project.

4 Also, identifying the State's Preferred
5 Alternative does not adopt or approval of that Preferred
6 Alternative today. And so our staff is recommending SR14
7 as our State's Preferred Alternative.

8 So for us when we develop these alternatives, as
9 Michelle had previously described, we take a look at how we
10 would avoid potential impacts within the context of the
11 document including biological resources, community impacts
12 and things like that. We also try to minimize to the
13 extent possible those impacts in those communities and
14 those resources. And if we still have significant impacts,
15 we try to minimize and mitigate those impacts as best that
16 we can through the process.

17 So I'll go through -- bear with me here as we go
18 through -- these are important factors as we evaluate.
19 We're going to go through the community impacts first and
20 then we'll go through the rest of the project that are
21 important as we look at how we have evaluated the
22 alternatives.

23 We have least favorable and most favorable in the
24 context of the key here that you see. So for community
25 factors we're going to take a look at transportation and

1 air quality. As most impacts are due during construction,
2 hauling construction equipment and as such as that,
3 materials and spoils, SR14 is the most favorable as it
4 generates the least amount of spoils. That's hauling,
5 which equals also a reduction in air quality impacts.

6 Also, the Refined SR14 has the least noise
7 impacts to sensitive receptors. And for right-of-way and
8 socio economics, the E2 Alternative is the most favorable
9 as it has the most extent underground section, which avoids
10 those impacts.

11 So the next step that we'll take a look at has to
12 do with project objectives as we go through the alignment.
13 For travel time, the E2 Alternative is the most favorable
14 as it has the shortest length. But for cost, E1
15 Alternative is most favorable for the least amount of
16 capital costs. The Refined SR14 is the most favorable when
17 it comes to constructability as it has shorter tunnel
18 sections and can expedite overall construction schedule
19 based upon the way the alignment is set up.

20 The Refined SR14 is also most favorable for
21 geotechnical considerations and risk as the tunnels here on
22 SR14 are shallower than on E1 or E2 and will go through
23 areas most favorable to ground conditions for tunneling.

24 The next portion on our analysis is the
25 environmental resources piece. The E2 Alternative will

1 have the least impacts to paleontological resources, given
2 to the depth of this alternative. For forest lands, the
3 Refined SR14 Alternative is the most favorable as the least
4 tunnel length adjacent to the Angeles National Forrest.
5 The Refined SR14 is also preferred over E1 and E2 with
6 respect to cultural resources. It would impact the fewest
7 known archeological resources as compared to the E1 and E2
8 Alternatives.

9 The Refined SR14 Alternative would also avoid any
10 potential impacts to tribal resources in the sensitive
11 areas in context of those same cultural resources. And the
12 least amount of tunneling under the Angeles National Forest
13 also reduces the risks of impacting the seeps and springs
14 within that forest.

15 And also, finally the Refined SR14 presents an
16 opportunity to restore the Vulcan Mine Site as Juan Carlos
17 had previously mentioned. It's currently an open gravel
18 mining pit and its natural topography and habitat is
19 consistent with the existing San Gabriel Mountains and the
20 Angeles Forest.

21 So based upon the environmental analysis to date
22 for the Draft Environmental EIR/EIS we've compared the E1
23 and E2 and SR14 is preferred since it would result again
24 and I'll summarize, the lowest risks to impacting surface
25 or groundwater and corresponding biology within the

1 national forest, the lowest constructability risk,
2 avoidance of key archeological and tribal resources and the
3 generation of the least amount of spoils and tunneling and
4 has reduced traffic and reduced air quality impacts.

5 So our next steps here. We're here today on the
6 identification of the Preferred. Right now, we're looking
7 forward in the winter of 2019 to '20 for the release of the
8 Draft EIR/EIS. And then in early '20-'21 the completion
9 and the adoption of both of the EIR/EIS, so the final
10 documents.

11 So today, for the Board action that the staff is
12 requesting is to concur with our recommendation of the
13 Refined SR14 as our State's Preferred Alternative. And I
14 wanted to reiterate today that our State Preferred
15 Alternative does not constitute the adoption or approval of
16 this Preferred Alternative.

17 That ends the presentation for Palmdale to
18 Burbank.

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay, thank you Mr.
20 McLoughlin.

21 So that as he just said ends the presentation on
22 the Palmdale to Burbank section. Let's move on now to the
23 Burbank to Los Angeles project section and the staff's
24 Recommended Preferred Alternative.

25 Do you want to make a statement? Okay. Ms.

1 Boehm.

2 MS. BOEHM: Great. Again, Michelle Boehm,
3 Southern California Regional Director. I did go through
4 some introductory information, which is similar for this
5 project. Again, each project is at the same milestone at
6 this meeting, so just wanted to point that out.

7 We are here today to ask you to concur with the
8 staff recommendation to identify the HSR Project
9 Alternative as the State's Preferred Alternative for the
10 Burbank to Los Angeles project section. Again, this is a
11 preliminary decision. All comments will continue to be
12 received and this project that we are presenting today may
13 be modified as we move through the process up until the
14 completion of the final environmental document.

15 To set a little context here for Southern
16 California, Burbank really represents an interesting
17 location for us. North of Burbank we are delivering --
18 oops! We've got a little thing going on here. North of
19 Burbank, basically we're delivering the promise. We have a
20 fully dedicated High-Speed Rail system that enables us to
21 make the trip from Los Angeles to San Francisco in 2 hours
22 40 or better.

23 South of Burbank, we are joining the existing
24 railroad corridor and multiplying the benefits. We become
25 a fellow operator within the existing railroad corridor and

1 are able to still meet all of our requirements, but then
2 multiply the benefits of the project for the Southern
3 California area by minimizing the impacts of the project by
4 operating within that existing railroad corridor and then
5 partnering with the other operators in the corridor,
6 LOSSAN, Amtrak, Metrolink to modernize that corridor to
7 21st Century standards.

8 So you will notice that these projects are a
9 little bit different in character from the projects to the
10 north. Here we are studying one build and one no-build
11 alternative, again with the focus on minimizing the impacts
12 of the project and multiplying the benefits when we bring
13 it into being.

14 So Burbank to Los Angeles, that's our smallest
15 project section here in Southern California. It's 14
16 miles. Again, we are studying this as a standalone project
17 for the purposes of the environmental document. So we are
18 studying the two stations at each end, the Burbank Airport
19 Station on the north, the Los Angeles Union Station at the
20 south where we are closely coordinating with L.A. Metro on
21 their Link US project. We have two projects under study
22 based on years of study and focus on the best way to do
23 this here in Southern California and they are evaluated
24 across multiple areas as we take a look at that. Again, a
25 similar timeline for the project. We did that program-wide

1 EIR/EIS for the statewide High-Speed Rail system in 2005.
2 And subsequent to that, we have been refining each of the
3 projects represented within that overall program.

4 Here, we were initially studying this section as
5 part of the Palmdale to Los Angeles section. And in 2014,
6 we amended the scoping, so that we could focus on the
7 Burbank to Los Angeles section and really dig in on joining
8 that shared railroad corridor. You can see subsequent
9 documents to that. Again, in 2016 we presented what we are
10 studying today, the shared urban corridor. And I will also
11 let you know that like all of our projects, we have done an
12 extensive public outreach process, going out throughout the
13 communities to understand what their concerns are as we
14 build towards identifying the project that we will build
15 here. You can see those captured here, again looking to
16 strike that balance that I talked about in the Palmdale to
17 Burbank section.

18 And here today we're here to talk to you about
19 the staff recommended State's Preferred Alternative. We
20 are recommending the Build Alternative. The No-Project
21 does not achieve our purpose and need in this location.
22 Key features are that we will share electrified tracks
23 through most of the project section. We will use existing
24 regional stations at stops. And we will modernize the
25 corridor as they talked about. So with that, I would like

1 to bring up the Project Manager, Melissa de la Peña, and
2 she will walk you through some of the specifics. Again,
3 similar sequence here in terms of being able to refine and
4 reduce the impacts of the project over time, you can see
5 those here. Again, the coordination at the Burbank
6 Airport, coordination up and down this corridor, it marks a
7 boundary between Los Angeles and Glendale. In many areas
8 it's right adjacent to the Los Angeles River, which is a
9 project of high importance for the City of L.A. And we
10 have been able over time to better integrate our work with
11 the work of those ongoing projects adjacent.

12 So Melissa?

13 MS. DE LA PEÑA: Thanks. Good morning Mr. Chair,
14 Members of the Board. I'm going to do a similar
15 walkthrough of the Burbank to L.A. section as Michelle
16 mentioned. It's a short 14 miles with Burbank Station on
17 the north and L.A. Union Station on the southern terminus
18 of the section.

19 The reminder, on the purple being underground and
20 the green being at grade, you can see that approximately
21 one mile is located below grade at the Burbank Airport
22 location. And then the remainder of the alignment is at
23 grade all the way down to Union Station. There are grade
24 separations along the corridor. And then this is a shared
25 corridor, so two electrified tracks, two non-electrified

1 tracks for the majority of it.

2 The project costs are estimated at 3.6 billion.
3 Similarly this is accounting for the full project and the
4 15 percent design stage that we are at currently. So a
5 little bit different than what was looked at in the
6 Business Plan.

7 Starting at Burbank focusing in on the station
8 area, you can see we go from underground to at grade along
9 the Ventura line. This is where we go from a dedicated
10 High-Speed Rail to the urban shared corridor. All the way
11 south from here, we're on a shared right-of-way with
12 existing operators. We were able to preserve the existing
13 Downtown Burbank's Metrolink station. And the alignment
14 here was chosen to minimize the interface with residential
15 areas.

16 Moving southerly into Glendale and Atwater, you
17 can see the alignment is right between L.A. and Glendale
18 boundaries. We remain along the existing corridor. And
19 then we've coordinated with the cities and local
20 jurisdictions along this alignment to plan the grade
21 separations. And in this area, we have an existing
22 historic station at Glendale that we've been able to
23 minimize impacts to as well.

24 The southern part into Los Angeles, this is where
25 we have some interface with the L.A. River. We do cross

1 the L.A. River on an existing structure. Also, there's
2 some work on the G2 parcel. The City of L.A. is planning a
3 park here. And it is actually across from another park on
4 that rail corridor. And our current alignment will stay
5 within the rail right-of-way between these two properties.

6 There's planned grade separations here as well
7 and as Michelle mentioned, a lot of coordination on with
8 Metro on the Link Union Station Project, which proposes
9 some run-through tracks improvements to the station.

10 And with that, I'll call up Mark McLoughlin.

11 MR. MCLOUGHLIN: Thank you. Good morning, Mark
12 McLoughlin, Director of Environmental Services for the
13 Authority. Thanks, Melissa.

14 Again, on identifying the State's Preferred
15 Alternative again it aligns with the federal laws that we
16 have, including MAP-21 and FAST Act and also with CEQA in
17 evaluating this Preferred Alignment.

18 So the process again is consistent with the
19 previous actions the Board previously took last month for
20 Bakersfield to Palmdale and previously the LGA a year
21 before that.

22 So today again we're asking the Board to concur
23 with the staff recommendation of the HSR Project
24 Alternative as the State's Preferred Alternative in the
25 project section for the Draft EIR/EIS.

1 So again, for the project we want to make sure
2 when we look at it we first to avoid impacts and resources
3 to the planning and engineering constraints. We also look
4 if we can minimize to the extent our impacts through design
5 or best management practices. And if we do have
6 significant impacts, we can develop measures and strategies
7 to avoid, minimize and reduce these impacts and compensate
8 for those impacts.

9 So for us we have to balance all of these factors
10 across the resource contacts in the documents. We have to
11 satisfy the project's purpose and need, which is very
12 important, the needs of objections and we have to balance
13 that with input from the public, public agencies, state and
14 federal and so that we understand how we're doing it in the
15 project. FRA is our lead federal agency, so we definitely
16 have a strong relationship with them incurring how we
17 approach forward in the project section.

18 So this is different than the previous section as
19 it's a very urbanized and restricted corridor. And this
20 project alternative is presented as a result of many design
21 refinement. It's a very tight corridor and has been
22 influenced by stakeholder meetings, as Michelle had
23 mentioned throughout the region in the last two, three
24 years, even longer than that. You know, so trying to get
25 input and comments on how to do that including the railroad

1 partners in this corridor.

2 So today, again we're recommending that the
3 State's Alternative be the HSR Project Alternative over No-
4 Project for the following reasons, which are important
5 here. It meets the project needs and objectives; it will
6 improve corridor safety significantly, which is a very
7 important factor in this corridor; fencing, positive train
8 control will be introduced and modernized in the current
9 operation to integrate the High-Speed Rail; it will improve
10 transportation through the grade separations as well as
11 other improvements in conjunction with Metro, another
12 important partner here on transportation and in this local
13 jurisdiction. It will also improve the long-term regional
14 air quality, green gas emissions also. And very important
15 too, many other community benefits such as fast, reliable
16 access to many parts of the state not easily accessible by
17 others today, other means of transportation; it'll connect
18 less separated communities; and also connect major and
19 established transportation hubs; and maximize the
20 intermodal opportunities to get to those hubs.

21 So the next steps where we are today, we're here
22 at the adoption or the recommendation for the State's
23 Preferred Alternative. The next steps are the Draft
24 EIR/EIS and the completion of those documents in the coming
25 year.

1 With that today we're asking you to concur with
2 our staff recommendation of the State's Preferred
3 Alternative in the Project EIR/EIS section. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

5 Okay, turning to the last section here in the
6 southland region, the Los Angeles to Anaheim project
7 section, Ms. Boehm?

8 MS. BOEHM: So this marks the final 30 miles of
9 the 80 miles of the alignments that we are talking about
10 today and the southern terminus of our Phase 1 Project.
11 Again, we are here today to ask the Board to concur with
12 the staff recommendation to identify the Project
13 Alternative as the State's Preferred Alternative in the Los
14 Angeles to Anaheim project section environmental documents
15 that will be released in the future.

16 Again just to repeat, this is based on
17 preliminary analysis. This is considered to be
18 preliminary. We fully expect a conversation about this
19 project throughout the process towards the completion of
20 the environmental document. And there is certainly the
21 expectations that modifications may be made between now and
22 the final environmental document.

23 So this is again the end of our Phase 1 Project.
24 This is part of our shared urban corridor here in Southern
25 California, starting at Los Angeles Union Station in the

1 north and traveling down to Arctic in the south.

2 Arctic, of course, has already been built and Los
3 Angeles Union Station is a historic station that we are
4 working very closely with L.A. Metro on retrofitting and
5 modernizing to accommodate High-Speed Rail service in the
6 future. This is also the corridor within which we will be
7 investing the \$500 million in Southern California MOU
8 bookend funds to deliver a very critical grade separation
9 project in the vicinity of Santa Fe Springs and to work on
10 the first phase of the modernization of Los Angeles Union
11 Station.

12 The same process here. Throughout the program we
13 had that 2005 Program EIR/EIS followed by subsequent
14 documents further defining the route and reflecting what we
15 were leaning through analysis and from the communities on
16 their concerns about the project. In 2016, we identified
17 the study of the project that we are talking about today.
18 And this section, like the previous urban corridor section
19 is a section in which we have a Project Alternative and a
20 No-Project or No-Build Alternative.

21 Like all of our other sections we've had a robust
22 conversation with community and the stakeholders that this
23 project will travel through, you can see that represented
24 here today. There is a variety of meetings that we hold,
25 whether they be public presentations with many people

1 participating, going out and meeting with small groups who
2 raise their hand and say I have a question or even talking
3 one-on-one with stakeholders or property owners in the
4 vicinity of the project.

5 Something that I would really like to highlight
6 for this section is we are closely coordinating with all of
7 the operators within this corridor today. All of those
8 railroads are in a conversation with us about us joining
9 the party essentially in the future. And so we will
10 upfront have the understanding with the other passenger
11 services and freight services on how this project will be
12 implemented here.

13 And the recommendation for this section is the
14 Project Alternative. The No-Project Alternative does not
15 achieve our purpose and need. The key features of this
16 project are the shared electrified tracks throughout most
17 of the project section, the use of the existing regional
18 stations, and the modernization of the corridor. Again,
19 this is an opportunity for all of us to work together and
20 deliver better mobility for Southern California than they
21 have today across all of the rail providers that they have
22 operating today. And then come in and introduce High-Speed
23 Rail as well.

24 Some of the successes that we've had over time,
25 as we've talked about sharing this corridor, is that we've

1 been able to reduce the right-of-way impacts up and down
2 the corridor in most locations. We've been able to reduce
3 the amount of proposed aerial structure, so we're able to
4 run the high-speed trains on the ground within the existing
5 railroad corridor. We've been able to reduce the impacts
6 to the freight tracks. The freight entity, BNSF, does own
7 a major share of this corridor. And so we've been able to
8 engage in a conversation with them about this future and
9 our ability to operate within the corridor.

10 And with that, I will turn it over to Melissa de
11 la Peña, our Project Manager.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Ms. de la Peña, welcome back.

13 MS. DE LA PEÑA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.
14 I will do a similar walk-through for the L.A. to Anaheim
15 section. This one's about 30 miles long and bounded by
16 L.A. Union Station on the north and Arctic on the south.
17 There are four stops proposed along this alignment, the two
18 intermediates being Norwalk-Santa Fe Springs and Fullerton.

19 There's about 3.9 miles of this alignment that
20 are elevated. And just under a mile that is below grade.
21 Also, grade separations are proposed along this alignment.
22 And it is again a shared corridor with other operators, us
23 on electrified tracks.

24 The estimated project cost for the proposed
25 project is 4.9 billion. Similar level of detail as the

1 other estimates mentioned today, this is to accompany the
2 environmental studies.

3 Walking down from Los Angeles Union Station this
4 is L.A. to Vernon, we will be going over the 101 on the
5 north side there with the run tracks associated with the
6 Link US Project and then back down to at grade with the
7 remaining tracks just before 1st Street. And then we run
8 along the L.A. River, along the west bank as shown here,
9 toward Vernon where we take a turn over the river again on
10 an existing structure at the Redondo Junction.

11 Shown in the inset here is Malabar Yard. It's an
12 existing yard. We're facilitating a connection here to be
13 able to do construction and pull up traffic where necessary
14 during that time.

15 Moving on from Vernon, Commerce area into
16 Montebello industrial area with a lot of important yards,
17 we're adding an additional track, so that we can have four
18 mainline tracks: two electrified, two non-electrified in
19 this location as well. The existing tracks will be
20 relocated to accommodate the additional tracks where
21 needed. In this area, Commerce Station, an existing
22 station, is going to be relocated to facilitate operations
23 between Hobart and Commerce Yard and facilitate the
24 modernization in this area.

25 Farther south from Montebello into Fullerton this

1 includes one area where we do peel off from the existing
2 corridor, slightly. That's at the Norwalk-Santa Fe Springs
3 station area where the passenger tracks will peel slightly
4 to the east on an elevated station. So that will be
5 reconfigured. Another reconfiguration is at Buena Park
6 Station. That one will be moved slightly to the north, to
7 accommodate the operations along the corridor. We also
8 have the slight underground section near Fullerton Airport
9 to avoid any conflicts with the air space.

10 Moving from Fullerton south into Anaheim at the
11 terminus, in this area we have two tracks. Two electrified
12 tracks shared by all the operators, so they will be
13 electrified. The alignment remains within the existing
14 rail right-of-way. Improvements at Fullerton Junction are
15 proposed to disentangle the freight and passenger traffic
16 which is cause for delay. And additional improvements are
17 under study to the east of Fullerton here to provide
18 further operational and construction staging benefits.

19 So that covers the alignment. And now I'll hand
20 it back over to Mark.

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

22 MR. MCLOUGHLIN: Thank you, Mark McLoughlin.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: This chart looks familiar.

24 MR. MCLOUGHLIN: Yes, sir. Again, working on
25 this alternative we're still being consistent as the others

1 with MAP-21, CEQA, FAST Act, the federal and state laws.
2 And previously, as you've seen before, I believe this
3 approach has worked well. It's based on community input,
4 stakeholder input on how we can engage the community.

5 So for us today, we want to make sure that we're
6 consistent in how we approach this and the staff
7 recommendation again is the same approach as the State's
8 Project Alternative that we're proposing today including
9 the context of these laws and the community-stakeholder
10 input.

11 So for us again we tried to avoid and minimize
12 the impacts on this section especially being in an urban
13 area. And important in this section too as this is a
14 narrow corridor also in the development and the refinement
15 of this alternative there's been numerous work and
16 solutions to provide numerous benefits and adjustments to
17 avoid impacts in this including there's fewer right-of-way
18 impacts, both commercial and residential. There's going to
19 be fewer visual and aesthetic impacts as there's a decrease
20 in the viaduct sections or elevated track way. And there's
21 fewer new bridges and footings over, in and around wetland
22 resources.

23 We also have reduced potential impacts to EJ
24 communities, environmental justice communities. We have
25 reduced 4F uses. And we also have, again, minimal impact

1 to existing railroad operations and operators in this
2 corridor.

3 So the important part of this with this Preferred
4 Alternative that we're putting before you today does meet
5 our program and project section objectives in the CEQA
6 context. We're providing other benefits and I'll list them
7 today.

8 We're providing inner city travel capacity to
9 supplement the existing over-used highways and commercial
10 airports. We meet future inner city travel demand that
11 will be unmet by the present systems if their High-Speed
12 Rail doesn't exist. And we also are maximizing intermodal
13 transportation connections with local transit airports and
14 the existing highway infrastructure and also providing a
15 different mode of travel, safe and reliable High-Speed
16 Rail.

17 So for this section here, we're here today on
18 that Preferred Alternative, our State's Preferred
19 Alternative that we have before you to the Board. The
20 Draft EIR/EIS and then the Final, those dates currently are
21 the draft to be released in 2020. And the final is to be
22 projected to be final in 2021.

23 I want to go back to Burbank to L.A. as those
24 dates for the draft is roughly the same, 2020 and then
25 roughly the final Burbank to L.A. in 2021 also.

1 So with that the staff's requesting your
2 concurrence today of our Project Alternative before you as
3 our State's Preferred Alternative. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay, thank you.

5 I'd like to thank all the staff members who
6 presented this morning. I think that the proposals were
7 both -- or the presentations, excuse me, were both cogent
8 and clear. I would like to just ask one or two questions
9 at this point before we turn to public comment just to
10 clarify a couple of things.

11 Despite the efforts of the staff, which I think
12 are laudable to minimize impacts obviously we can't
13 completely avoid impacts. And so I just would like to
14 clarify before we turn to public comment, because many
15 citizens here may have these concerns. We've
16 gotten a number of letters from the Sylmar community. I
17 understand that we're tunneling under Sylmar. I understand
18 that citizens are still concerned about that. Can the
19 staff just take a moment and talk about the depth of those
20 tunnels and what the possible surface impacts would be, so
21 that people would know? Do we have someone? I didn't give
22 you any forewarning of this, I know. So I don't know if
23 you have this information available to you.

24 MS. BOEHM: Sure. I'll ask Juan Carlos Velasquez
25 to come up with some details. That is a very important

1 concern. We hear that across the sections where we are
2 tunneling. So we have done preliminary drilling and
3 preliminary desktop studies to understand the quality of
4 the rock to make sure that we can safely tunnel in those
5 areas, with no impacts at the surface. And I will let Juan
6 Carlos talk specifically about the depth

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right, thank.

8 Mr. Velasquez, thank you.

9 MR. VELASQUEZ: Yeah, in the area that you're
10 talking about, in the Sylmar area we're approximately 200-
11 feet deep, or so. I mean, the ground varies, so it's not a
12 consistent depth. But that compares to a subway for
13 example, which would be only 80 feet deep or below the
14 surface. So at a 200-foot depth, there would be no surface
15 impact.

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: From operations, what about
17 the tunneling itself, the drilling?

18 MR. VELASQUEZ: Again, the tunneling is done with
19 -- proposed to be done with tunnel boring machines. And
20 these are very slow moving non-percussive type operations.
21 They're meant to just peel away the rock and not impact the
22 surface.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. I mean citizens
24 obviously we'll still hear your comments, but I just wanted
25 to help try to inform things before that.

1 The second thing is obviously as we've gone
2 through this process over the last couple of years there
3 have been some concerns, particularly with the E1, E2 and
4 previously E3 potential routes on the equestrian
5 communities in the northeast quadrant in the San Fernando
6 Valley, in Shadow Hills and Lake View Terrace, Sunland,
7 Tujunga. It's my understanding that the proposed Preferred
8 Alternative Route completely avoids those communities. Are
9 there any remaining impacts that the staff sees in those
10 communities?

11 MS. BOEHM: That is correct. The Refined SR14
12 completely avoids Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Sunland,
13 Tujunga and Shadow Hills.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: And to the second part of my
15 question, are there any impacts that you see on those
16 communities from the Preferred Alternate that you've
17 proposed?

18 MS. BOEHM: At this juncture we believe they
19 would be relatively un-impacted. There may be minor
20 traffic that we are still studying in terms of proposing
21 routes during the construction.

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Construction impacts. Okay.
23 Let me just ask my colleagues if anybody else had
24 any focused questions like that, again to help inform the
25 public before their comments?

1 (No audible response.)

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. With that, I'll turn to
3 our Secretary, Mr. Drozd?

4 MR. DROZD: Yes, just a brief announcement. This
5 will be the last call for comment cards. If there are any
6 remaining out there, please submit them promptly. Thank
7 you.

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Yes, if you have
9 comment cards, please give them to the Secretary, Mr.
10 Drozd, all right?

11 So I have these cards in front of me. Mr. Drozd,
12 you've put the public officials at the top?

13 MR. DROZD: That's correct.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: And the rest of them are in
15 the order in which you received them?

16 MR. DROZD: Correct.

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Thank you.

18 All right. We're going to then proceed through
19 public comments. There are a number of comments, so in
20 order to give all of your fellow citizens an equal
21 opportunity to speak I'm asking that we limit this to two
22 minutes each. And I will ask people to respect those
23 timelines, but we do want to hear from you. We'll be
24 attentive, but we ask you to respect those timelines.

25 We'll start with the Honorable Marsha McLean,

1 Mayor Pro Tem of the City of Santa Clarita. And she'll be
2 followed by Mike Aguilera from Representative Schiff's
3 office and then Arturo Garcia from Assemblymember Rivas's
4 office, so be prepared to come up when it's your turn.

5 Good morning, Madam Mayor.

6 MAYOR MCLEAN: Good morning. Thank you, it's a
7 pleasure to be here. Two minutes doesn't afford much of an
8 opportunity, but I assume you didn't mention the letter
9 from Santa Clarita. I hope you all have received it?

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes.

11 MAYOR MCLEAN: Since 2015, the Santa Clarita City
12 County Council has taken the position that if the
13 California High-Speed Rail Authority Project gets
14 constructed in our region, the only potentially acceptable
15 alignment is one that is fully underground between Palmdale
16 and Burbank. The continued inclusion of surface and
17 elevated structures in all three alignments under
18 consideration does not meet that standard.

19 Staff has given you pretty words, but
20 unfortunately it doesn't take into effect the impact on
21 people's homes, lives, businesses, land use and in our
22 case, also much cherished open space with endangered
23 species.

24 In-depth analysis and full disclosure must take
25 place regarding potential noise and vibration impacts of

1 the tunnels under homes, particularly in the Sand Canyon
2 neighborhood of Santa Clarita. Your staff mentioned that
3 this alignment allows more shallow depth. The Proposed
4 SR14 Alignment comes at grade in the Santa Clarita Valley
5 at a location that is meant for property owners potentially
6 converting into industrial, commercial usage. The
7 opportunity to secure reclamation and economic
8 revitalization of those areas will not occur without the
9 rail alignment being fully underground.

10 The Preferred Alternative also has at grade and
11 bridge truss structures across the sensitive environmental
12 areas of the Santa Clara River, Bee Canyon and City of
13 Santa Clarita-owned open spaces, which is designed to
14 facilitate critical wildlife movement between the northern
15 and southern sections of the Angeles National Forest.

16 There must be many, many mitigations if this
17 route is going to take place. And finally, I would just
18 hope that you will, because of the impacts to our area --
19 you've taken it away from others, but given it to us --
20 that you will direct staff to have a meeting out in Santa
21 Clarita. Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mayor. And we will
23 continue to work with you and your community. Thank you.

24 Mr. Aguilera followed by Arturo Garcia followed
25 by Jason Manca representing Supervisor Barger. Good

1 morning, sir.

2 MR. AGUILERA: Good morning Chairman Richard,
3 Vice Chair Richards and the Board. My name is Mike
4 Aguilera. Today I'm speaking on behalf of Congressman Adam
5 Schiff who couldn't be here today, but sends the following
6 statement:

7 "Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to
8 express my views on the proposed High-Speed Rail routes
9 through our community and the Angeles National Forest.
10 While I believe that alternatives to our increasingly
11 congested air space and highways like High-Speed Rail are
12 important to accommodate the continued growth of our
13 population in California and elsewhere, I have profound
14 concerns about the routes proposed today by the High-Speed
15 Rail Authority. Any route that would adversely affect the
16 quality of life and value of residential properties in our
17 community, or would undermine efforts to preserve the
18 pristine nature of our forests, imposes too high a cost to
19 merit consideration. Unfortunately the routes currently
20 proposed threaten to diminish both our local neighborhoods
21 and the forest. As such, I cannot support them and urge
22 the High-Speed Rail to go back to the drawing board with
23 fresh ideas on how to meet both our transportation needs
24 and community concerns. Thank you so much." (Applause.)

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay, folks. It's just going

1 to prolong things and I understand that people have strong
2 feelings about this, but this is a public meeting. And so
3 I ask please for your consideration as we listen to public
4 comments.

5 Arturo Garcia representing Assemblymember Rivas
6 followed by Jason Manca for L.A. County Supervisor Barger.
7 Good morning, sir.

8 MR. GARCIA: Good morning, Board Members. My
9 name is Arturo. I'm here to speak on behalf of
10 Assemblymember Luz Rivas. She would like to start by
11 thanking the Board for holding this meeting today and for
12 the opportunity to provide comments. The Assembly Member
13 would also like to wish Chief Executive Officer, Brian
14 Kelly a speedy recovery.

15 The Assembly Member believes that it is critical
16 that the state continues to advance transportation projects
17 that reduce greenhouse gas and particulate emissions, which
18 adversely impact disadvantaged communities. The state must
19 also do more to create cost-effective alternatives to get
20 people out of their cars and into public transportation.
21 However, Assemblymember Rivas, like many of her colleagues,
22 was not in office at the time the original vote was taken
23 to advance the High-Speed Rail Project. She has not had
24 the opportunity to discuss the significant costs associated
25 with this expansive transportation proposal.

1 Several reports have come out over the last few
2 years expressing concerns over its growing costs and even
3 as recently as today with the Legislative Analyst Office
4 calling into question the fiscal prudence of the High-Speed
5 Rail Project. While financial feasibility and
6 accountability are of significant concern to the Assembly
7 Member, of equal concern is the impact on the constituents
8 she was elected to represent.

9 Please keep in mind that there is not a stop in
10 our district for residents to be able get on the High-Speed
11 Rail. Nor can we imagine that they would be able to afford
12 the price of tickets that will be charged once the project
13 is completed. At recent hearings conducted here in the San
14 Fernando Valley, many of the constituents in our district
15 have been left with many unanswered questions about what
16 will happen to their businesses, their quality of life and
17 the homes that generations of residents have grown up in.

18 Given these concerns, Assemblymember Rivas cannot
19 support the route, Refined SR14, that is currently under
20 consideration today. Our office looks forward to working
21 with the High-Speed Rail Board and its staff in the months
22 and years to come. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. Jason Manca, L.A.
24 County Supervisor Barger followed by Jessica Orellana, I
25 believe it is, from Supervisor Kuehl's Office. Good

1 morning.

2 MR. MANCA: Good morning. Thank you for having
3 me today. Firstly, as you know the Los Angeles County
4 Board of Supervisors unanimously supported my predecessor,
5 Michael Antonovich's motion to oppose the E2 Alignment.
6 This action prevented potential impacts to the communities
7 and sensitive environmental areas, especially in the
8 northeast San Fernando Valley.

9 Staff's recommendation today to select the
10 Refined SR14 as the Preferred Alternative Alignment is a
11 welcome and appreciated development. However, this route
12 also carries some concerning and potentially significant
13 impacts, particularly in the northern area of my district.

14 As staff moves forward on the environmental
15 analysis it is imperative for the Preferred Alternative
16 Alignment that this Board commits to continue to analyze
17 the feasibility of further mitigation, such as tunneling in
18 rural communities of northern Los Angeles County, including
19 in Acton and Agua Dulce, to decrease the impacts to
20 property and general welfare of our residents.

21 I appreciate your attention to the joint request
22 to deliver a blended alternative service from Palmdale.
23 And I value the conversations that follow. I truly believe
24 that through a coordinated effort there is a way to work
25 outside of the box and to deliver improvements to this

1 corridor that would provide immediate and mutual benefits
2 to our riders and the communities served by the Antelope
3 Valley Line. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much.

5 Okay. Jessica, I hope I pronounced it correctly,
6 is it Orellana or Orillano?

7 MS. ORELLANA: Orellana.

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Orellana. Good morning, Ms.
9 Orellana. And you'll be followed by Brendon Araujo of the
10 City of Vernon. Thank you. Good morning.

11 MS. ORELLANA: Good morning. Thank you.

12 The Supervisor is thankful for the revisions made
13 to the route by the California High-Speed Rail and for you
14 holding this community meeting here today. There are still
15 safety concerns that need to be addressed, such as noise,
16 pedestrian and vehicle safety etcetera, which we hope can
17 be addressed soon. We will continue to listen to our
18 constituent's feedback.

19 And at this time the Supervisor does not have a
20 statement but she will be submitting a statement soon, a
21 letter to the Board and our constituents.

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Supervisor. We
23 will take her letter under advisement very seriously.
24 Thank you.

25 MS. ORELLANA: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I hope I didn't mispronounce
2 it, Mr. Araujo; is that correct?

3 MR. ARAUJO: Araujo.

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Araujo, okay. I'm sorry, sir,
5 for mispronouncing your name from City of Vernon. And
6 you'll be followed by Arcelia Arce from Councilwoman Nury
7 Martinez's office. Good morning, sir.

8 MR. ARAUJO: Good morning. The City of Vernon is
9 home to nearly 1,500 businesses that employ nearly 45,000
10 people. The City offers an attractive business environment
11 due to its ability to offer some of the region's lowest
12 utility rates. Its proximity to major freeways makes it a
13 prime location for the transportation, warehousing and
14 logistics industry. As a result the City has a low vacancy
15 rate and serves as a critical component in the goods
16 movement of the Southern California region.

17 There's been a lot of discussion today about
18 minimizing impacts. But when it comes to the City of
19 Vernon, it would be hard to conceive of an alignment that
20 has a more detrimental impact. The 21 businesses displaced
21 by the alignment today employ over 1,200 people. They are
22 some of the largest energy users in the City; revenues from
23 electricity sales help pay for critical services provided
24 by the city, services such as fire, safety and public
25 works.

1 The total value of these impacted parcels exceeds
2 \$90 million. Where will these jobs and businesses be
3 relocated? Given the City's low vacancy rate, it is
4 probable that they will relocate outside of the City. The
5 displacement of these businesses will cost the City over \$8
6 million in annual electricity sales and its general fund
7 will take a million dollar loss in perpetuity.

8 The fixed costs of delivering reliable utilities
9 will be spread over a smaller number of customers raising
10 costs for everyone, weakening one of the key advantages the
11 city offers prospective businesses.

12 Furthermore, the alignment severs a critical
13 gateway into the city. The Pennington Way Bridge over
14 Atlantic Boulevard provides over 4,000 motorists and
15 freight operators an alternative entry into the city away
16 from the congested Bandini Boulevard and Atlantic Boulevard
17 intersection. Under the proposed alignment these vehicles
18 will now be forced onto adjacent already congested
19 intersections. The Authority touts the High-Speed Rail's
20 ability to create jobs and mobility in the State of
21 California. In its quest to build the nation's first High-
22 Speed Rail line, the City hopes it can find an alignment
23 that does not displace 400 jobs and disrupt the goods
24 movement of the region in the process. Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

1 Arcelia, is it Arce?

2 MS. ARCE: Yeah, Arce. Hi, Good morning, Arcelia
3 Arce.

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good morning.

5 MS. ARCE: I am representing Councilwoman Nury
6 Martinez today. In 2017, Councilwoman Martinez submitted a
7 letter stating her opposition to the Refined SR14
8 Alternative unless it was modified to run belowground
9 through Sun Valley.

10 Staff recently released the State's Preferred
11 Alternative to be carried forward into the Draft EIR/EIS.
12 Today you are considering the staff Preferred Alternative
13 that recommends the SR14 option, which includes a 12-mile
14 stretch that would run aboveground in Sun Valley. As such,
15 Councilwoman Martinez remains opposed to the staff's
16 Preferred Alternative.

17 The communities of the six council districts,
18 specifically Sun Valley, already bear the burden of being
19 home to existing rail service and the majority of the
20 City's waste haulers, trash facilities and auto-dismantling
21 yards. Historically, the community of Sun Valley has been
22 the dumping ground. Councilwoman Martinez remains
23 steadfast in her desire to protect this community and leave
24 it in a better condition than when she was elected.
25 Unfortunately, the California High-Speed Rail Preferred

1 Alternative does not help her further that goal.

2 Through correspondence and meetings with staff,
3 we laid out our concerns about the impacts that an
4 aboveground route would have on the district. The staff
5 recommendation reflects a preference to preserve the
6 quality of life of one area over another. We request that
7 staff continue to review how the alignment can be further
8 refined to run belowground in Sun Valley. We thank High-
9 Speed Rail staff for the support and attention that you
10 have given to our office as we have made our way through
11 this lengthy process. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much.

13 Our next speaker is Eveline Bravo-Ayala
14 representing State Senator Robert Hertzberg followed by
15 Michael Behen from the City of Palmdale. And after Mr.
16 Behen it will be Noe Negrete from the City of Santa Fe
17 Springs.

18 Good morning, ma'am.

19 MS. BRAVO-AYALA: Good morning, Eveline Bravo-
20 Ayala, staff for Senator Robert Hertzberg of the San
21 Fernando Valley. This was a letter that I'm about to read
22 submitted on October 9th, 2018 addressed to the Authority.
23 On behalf of Senator Bob Hertzberg, I would like to read
24 them before the Board today.

25 "After careful deliberation and listening to the

1 concerns raised by my constituents in the San Fernando
2 Valley I write to express my opposition to the construction
3 of any at or aboveground route regarding the Palmdale to
4 Burbank project section of High-Speed Rail. I have had
5 many conversations with concerned residents and I
6 appreciate the responsiveness to the critical community
7 feedback to you and the High-Speed Rail Authority have
8 demonstrated. I respect the effort of the High-Speed Rail
9 Authority and acknowledge the benefit that a High-Speed
10 Rail transportation line can provide to the residents of
11 the State of California and the San Fernando Valley.

12 "However, as you and I have discussed repeatedly
13 including as far back as April of 2015, the impact that at
14 or aboveground operations would have on the San Fernando
15 Valley Communities I proudly represent is unacceptable to
16 my constituents. Thank you for your time and
17 consideration."

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

19 Michael Behen followed by Noe Negrete followed by
20 Lawrence King from Acton-Agua Dulce USD.

21 MR. BEHEN: Good morning Mr. Chair, Members of
22 the Board, staff. My name is Michael Behen. I'm from the
23 City of Palmdale, Department of Public Works. First of
24 all, I want to say thank you for coming to Burbank for this
25 meeting, for this Board Meeting. It's acknowledged and

1 appreciated. Thank you for coming to Southern California.

2 I think today is definitely a step in the right
3 direction to moving forward and to the eventual release of
4 the environmental impact report. We've been working with
5 High-Speed Rail staff for many years and we've got healthy
6 conversations. Sometimes we don't always agree, but we
7 engage in good conversations that lead to good solutions.

8 There's three people that I'd like to acknowledge
9 today for the record, in terms of those working
10 relationships. And that's Michelle Boehm, that is Juan
11 Carlos Velasquez, and Rick Simon. They have worked with us
12 very closely and I thought it was important to acknowledge
13 them today.

14 Currently, the Antelope Valley has about 85,000
15 people who commute every day on State Route 14. Right now,
16 we have some of the longest commute times in the United
17 States of America and so quite frankly, we're desperate for
18 transportation infrastructure. And we believe that High-
19 Speed Rail is one of those components of transportation
20 that can help us help get our people to different places
21 for work and other.

22 So in terms of updates we are currently working a
23 Station Area Plan. It was funded through the California
24 High-Speed Rail. We'll be finished with the plan in about
25 a year. That will be transit-oriented development land use

1 plan focused around the station. We've heard the news
2 about Brightline, which is a High-Speed Rail train that
3 will go from Las Vegas to Victorville to Palmdale. And
4 they will break ground next year and be finished by 2022.

5 We're also hearing about the Olympics that will
6 be here in 2028 in Los Angeles, the Raiders Stadium that
7 will be open in 2020, the Ram-Charger Stadium that will be
8 open in 2020. All of these major infrastructure projects
9 could use High-Speed Rail to help people get them there.

10 So in terms of that, we would consider for the
11 next business plan to move Palmdale up in the cycle, based
12 on all these things. And I appreciate your time. Thank
13 you.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much Mr.
15 Behan.

16 Noe Negrete, is that correct? Did I pronounce
17 your name correctly?

18 MR. NEGRETE: Yes, Noe as the first name. That's
19 correct.

20 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Thank you for that and
21 then followed by Lawrence King. Good morning, sir.

22 MR. NEGRETE: Thank you. I'm a Director of
23 Public Works for the City of Santa Fe Springs, but I'm also
24 representing the Gateway Cities Technical Advisory
25 Committee, which makes up the cities that are south of

1 Union Station to the LA-Orange County line.

2 And again we're here today to ask you to delay
3 the approval of the Preferred Alternative from L.A. to
4 Anaheim segment. We have been working closely with your
5 staff, Michelle, Melissa. But from what they've given us
6 have been limited portions of preliminary engineering
7 design plans that we have identified missing engineering
8 outputs per your own High-Speed Rail guidelines. We need
9 to receive the missing technical studies and plans before
10 providing input and before providing our evaluation on the
11 community impacts.

12 We have concept ideas for the Santa Fe Springs-
13 Norwalk Station that appear to have been dismissed by your
14 staff with less than thoughtful responses.

15 We have additional recommendations to be
16 presented by the City of Commerce regarding the impacts in
17 their city, which would substantially impact the Preferred
18 Alternative.

19 It is important to us that we are truly
20 collaborating with High-Speed Rail and recommendations are
21 potentially being incorporated into the Preferred
22 Alternative and ultimately into the EIR. We too do see
23 this as an opportunity for improved regional mobility,
24 however not at the expense of our local communities. Thank
25 you for your time.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

2 Lawrence King from the Acton-Agua Dulce Unified
3 School District, I believe. And then that will conclude
4 our elected and appointed officials and then we'll move to
5 the Judy Trujillo followed by Darrell Clarke.

6 MR. KING: Thank you. Thank you, I appreciate
7 you allowing me the opportunity to speak. I'm the
8 Superintendent for the Acton-Agua Dulce Unified School
9 District and I'm speaking on our behalf. I want to thank
10 you for opportunity, Mr. President, and I want to talk a
11 little bit of details of the trains that it sounds like
12 approximately on average 22 passings per hour. This is
13 about 1,600 feet from our high school. Vasquez High School
14 does sit below the freeway, State Route 14, as somebody
15 previously mentioned from staff. But the sound frequency
16 differences are significant. So there is a lower frequency
17 sound that's equated to the traffic noise at 60, 70, 80
18 miles per hour. But there's an entirely different
19 frequency emitted from High-Speed Rail that exceeds 200
20 miles an hour and so the barriers that are put into place
21 aren't significant to combat that.

22 And so we work on things in our school district
23 like mindfulness, the whole child, social-emotional-mental-
24 physical well-being. These things could contribute to an
25 impact in a negative way to student learning. So I'm more

1 here to talk about the student learning piece.

2 I do want to read a statement by one of our
3 community members if I can briefly. So this is from Ken
4 Pfaltzgraff, a community member. And he has asked me to
5 express his gratitude for making this meeting quickly
6 available publically to the local regions. He has concerns
7 about the tailings that relate to silicosis. He's worried
8 about the air quality as the train daylights around the
9 school in addition to noise issues. Hauling tailings out
10 of the underground section and loading and processing them
11 into the open air in the Red Rover area puts a bedrock of
12 nature that is typically found in mining regions into the
13 air along with increasing heavy truck trips to the area.

14 With a number of striking geological
15 similarities, he's concerned that daylighting the train and
16 processing the tailings will create another Delamar, Nevada
17 situation.

18 That's his comment and I'll close that. And I'll
19 close with my own just to say again thank you for your time
20 and I appreciate all of your staff's effort on this
21 project. Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

23 Judi Trujillo followed by Darrell Clarke followed
24 by Kathleen Trinity. Ms. Trujillo, good morning.

25 MS. TRUJILLO: Good morning to you and Members of

1 the Board. My name is Judi Trujillo. I live in Sun
2 Valley, California, in the La Tuna Canyon area. I found
3 this community impact statement on a Los Angeles City
4 Clerk's website.

5 "On September 20th, 2018 the City of Los Angeles
6 Foothill Trails District Neighborhood Council voted to
7 amend its support of Council File 16-1068, the City
8 Council's opposition to the Redefined E2 Alignment for the
9 California High-Speed Rail Authority's Palmdale to Burbank
10 project segment. And any other alignments that would cross
11 any natural segments of the Los Angeles River and its
12 tributaries, including the Big Tujunga Wash, at or above
13 grade within the City of Los Angeles. Including, but not
14 limited to Redefined SR14 and Redefined E1 routes. The
15 high-speed train may negatively affect our aquifers,
16 groundwater resources and wildlife. Additionally, all
17 three proposed routes, at or above grade portions include
18 over 6.4 miles that are within the very high fire hazard
19 severity zone."

20 "The Foothills Trails District National Council
21 continues to join with other communities in the northeast
22 San Fernando Valley who believe more needs to be done to
23 protect our homes, businesses and equestrian areas from the
24 negative impact of SR14, E1 and E2 high-speed train
25 routes."

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

2 MS. TRUJILLO: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Darrell Clarke from the Sierra
4 Club, followed by Kathleen Trinity followed by Marlene
5 Fawkes.

6 MR. CLARKE: Thank you and welcome. I'm Darrell
7 Clarke, Sierra Club Angeles Chapter Transportation Chair.
8 Sierra Club endorsed California High-Speed Rail in 2008
9 with our endorsement of Prop 1A for the benefits for the
10 alternative to long car drives, interstate plane flights,
11 oil use and road and airport expansion. We continue to
12 seek those benefits.

13 For the essential Palmdale to Burbank section we
14 are awaiting the science in the environmental study before
15 taking a formal position on the route alternative. But I
16 really want to commend staff's hard work here at threading
17 the needle and coming up with an alternative that avoids
18 many sensitive locations, like not going through the City
19 of Santa Clarita, not going through the City of San
20 Fernando, not going behind Hansen Dam.

21 And finally, I have to wonder as a long-time
22 transit advocate in the comments we've already heard, why
23 the recently approved Van Nuys Boulevard light rail line,
24 electrically powered, is okay and yet electrically powered
25 high-speed rail in the same neighborhood suddenly is a

1 horrible thing. They're both electrically powered.
2 Aboveground, what's the difference really? So thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Clarke.
4 Kathleen Trinity, followed by Marlene Fawkes,
5 followed by Russ Fawkes. Ms. Trinity, good morning.

6 MS. TRINITY: Good morning, Chairman Richard and
7 Board. I'm Kathleen Trinity from Acton.

8 If you have ever spent time in a canyon then you
9 must know that the acoustics are excellent. Sound travels
10 up the canyon and off the sides. Your engineers have said
11 that the sound of the train can be mitigated, even the
12 greater sonic-type boom from the east mountain tunnels.
13 Not only will the mitigations be totally inadequate, they
14 will introduce walls and berms in the long ugly massive
15 viaduct that is -- including in the ground section, about a
16 mile, fences and catenary cables, and the train itself,
17 which will industrialize our neighborhood. The sound will
18 rise to more than 85 to 90 decibels on the viaduct and over
19 110 decibels from the tunnels. And it will be almost
20 constant, every six minutes or even less.

21 For adults over 50, more than half the residents
22 in Red Rover Mine Canyon, it will mean endless stress
23 contributing to cardiovascular problems and sleep
24 disturbances. Children are vulnerable at 55 decibels. And
25 for any resident, it will mean the loss of peaceful outdoor

1 time, something very highly valued in Acton.

2 Red Rover Mine Canyon has about 112 homes and 60
3 horses at last count. We're also equestrian. While it is
4 true that some horses can adapt to noise, largely when they
5 are in a corral, it is the very rare horse that can be
6 trained to handle loud outbursts while being ridden on the
7 street or trail. What you are asking the residents to do
8 is to put their horses and themselves into the very
9 dangerous situation where they could be thrown even into
10 traffic or not to ride at all within a mile at least of the
11 viaduct. You can have all the brilliant engineering you
12 want, but what's missing here is the human factor. And
13 isn't that what it's really about in the end?

14 This route will be the degradation of our
15 neighborhood and our community. The noise and blight will
16 take away from us the very things for which we moved to Red
17 Rover and the mine place. Know that your choice will be to
18 destroy an established residential equestrian neighborhood.
19 Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Trinity.

21 Marlene Fawkes followed by Russ Fawkes followed
22 by Chris Darga.

23 MS. FAWKES: Good morning.

24 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good morning.

25 MS. FAWKES: My name is Marlene Fawkes. I'm a

1 resident of Acton. I'd also like to convey my concerns
2 with the noise level of the High-Speed Rail and its impact
3 on the rural community of Acton, with three schools,
4 numerous outdoor animals and many retired seniors. The
5 Federal Railroad Administration's 10 to 15 dba threshold
6 for criteria, for quiet rural areas is insupportable,
7 because in such areas it would be jarring if the noise
8 level even increased by half. FRA's 10 to 15 dba criteria
9 for establishing significant noise impacts on quiet areas
10 is also insupportable, because it is significantly higher
11 than what has been adopted by CEQA reviews conducted by
12 other state agencies.

13 For instance, the California Public Utilities
14 Commission adopted a 5 dba as the appropriate threshold
15 criteria for establishing whether a project would
16 significantly increase 24-hour averaged ambient noise level
17 within the rural community of Acton.

18 These facts must inform and direct the California
19 High-Speed Rail Authority's environmental analysis of the
20 Palmdale-Burbank High-Speed Rail segment, such that in the
21 event HSRA relies upon a 24-hour average noise impact
22 methodology to assess indirect noise impacts, then a 5 dba
23 threshold criteria must be adopted for quiet areas to
24 properly account for ambient noise impacts in a rural
25 context. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

2 Russ Fawkes followed by Chris Darga followed by
3 Steve Correa.

4 MR. FAWKES: Good morning, I'm Russ Fawkes. My
5 wife and I, our children and our grandchildren are all
6 residents of Acton. For years Acton residents have
7 repeatedly asked the California High-Speed Rail Authority
8 to develop underground alternatives in Acton. These
9 requests have been made both verbally at public scoping
10 meetings and in writing. But the Authority engineers have
11 stated that they have identified no impediments, which
12 would prevent CHSRA from constructing the Acton portions of
13 the SR14 and the E1, the E2 routes underground. To the
14 contrary, your engineers have repeatedly stated that it is
15 merely their preference to daylight the Palmdale-Burbank
16 High-Speed Rail segment in Acton.

17 Now it's an established fact that by not
18 daylighting the tracks in Acton, noise and aesthetic
19 impacts are eliminated completely and groundwater resources
20 are less impacted, because the routes are deeper.

21 Staying underground in Acton is entirely
22 feasible, because both the SR14 and the E1, E2 routes
23 depart the Palmdale area at an elevation of approximately
24 2,800 feet. And from there, they should drop down to
25 Burbank, which has an elevation of less than 1,000 feet.

1 However, and for reasons that remain entirely
2 unclear, CHSRA engineers have only considered routes that
3 go up in elevation from Palmdale to punch through in Acton
4 and wind through the community like a roller coaster before
5 dropping back down to Burbank. And the engineers have
6 never identified a single reason for this configuration,
7 other than it's their preference.

8 CEQA demands that the California High-Speed Rail
9 Authority develop a reasonable range of, and I'm quoting,
10 "A reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives
11 that will foster informed decision making and public
12 participation and must publicly disclose its reasoning for
13 selecting those alternatives. That's CEQA Guidelines
14 15126.6(a).

15 The California High-Speed Rail Authority has
16 abjectly failed in this regard, because it has never
17 explained its continuing refusal to consider belowground
18 routes in Acton.

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Mr. Fawkes, can I ask you to
20 conclude so we can let others citizens speak?

21 MR. FAWKES: Sure. The California High-Speed
22 Rail Authority is continuing disregard for feasible
23 underground alternatives in Acton that would eliminate all
24 noise, aesthetic, animal and biological resource impacts
25 and significantly reduce groundwater and well impacts is an

1 outrageous violation of CEQA and therefore entirely
2 unacceptable.

3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

4 Chris Darga followed by Steve Correa followed by
5 Cindy Sower.

6 MR. DARGA: Hello. My name is Christopher Darga.
7 I'm a resident of Acton, along with my wife. And I feel
8 compelled that I have to share my concerns regarding the
9 High-Speed Rail routes proposed through Acton. First of
10 all, I see absolutely no benefit for residents of Acton,
11 Agua Dulce, Santa Clarita, San Fernando, all of the
12 communities in between Palmdale and Burbank.

13 The SR14 route for the High-Speed Rail will
14 create significant aesthetic impacts, because it will tower
15 over the freeways and highways and dominate view sheds from
16 Shannon Valley and Acton Valley. Similarly, the E1 and E2
17 routes will create significant aesthetic impacts, because
18 it will invoke an enormous earthen berm and will tower over
19 Aliso Canyon thereby obliterating views of the Aliso-
20 Arrastre Special Interest Area from Soledad Canyon all the
21 way to Crown Valley Road in Central Acton.

22 It is essential that the California High-Speed
23 Rail Authority properly affirm that both the SR14 and the
24 E1, E2 alignments will substantially degrade Acton's
25 existing visual character and cause significant adverse

1 aesthetic impacts that can only be mitigated by placing
2 these routes underground through Acton and Agua Dulce.

3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

4 Steve Correa, then Cindy Sower and then Susan
5 Lustig.

6 MR. CORREA: Good morning members of the Board.
7 My name is Steve Correa. I come from the neighborhood of
8 Sun Valley, which is affected. And I have concerns about
9 the Palmdale to Burbank project section with regards to the
10 community involvement in these sections.

11 It's too early for the staff to be making this
12 recommendation, because the communities have not endorsed
13 the suggestion of selecting a proposed alternative. In the
14 resolution 18-19 it says, "The Authority has briefed the
15 regulatory agencies and conducted stakeholder working
16 groups and open houses in Palmdale, Acton, Sun Valley and
17 Pacoima to seek input, which was carefully considered."

18 It should also say whereas the neighborhoods
19 affected have rejected the proposed alternative. We have
20 letters from our representatives including Senator Robert
21 Hertzberg where he said, "After careful deliberation and
22 listening to the concerns raised by my constituents in the
23 San Fernando Valley, I write to express my opposition to
24 the construction of any at or above grade route regarding
25 the Palmdale to Burbank project section of the High-Speed

1 Rail. I have had many conversations with concerned
2 residents and I appreciate the responsiveness to the
3 critical community feedback you have and the High-Speed
4 Rail Authority have demonstrated.

5 "However as you and I have discussed repeatedly,
6 including as far back as April, 2015, impact that at or
7 above grade operations would have on the San Fernando
8 Valley communities I proudly represent is unacceptable to
9 my constituents."

10 That was a letter to Dan Richards. We have a
11 letter from Assemblymember Luz Rivas saying to Mr. Brian
12 Kelly, the Chief Executive Officer, saying --

13 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Mr. Correa, can I just suggest
14 those letters are before us and since there's a limited
15 time, we will accept that those are letters from your
16 representatives. I just wanted to give you an opportunity
17 to express your particular views.

18 MR. CORREA: My views agree with the
19 Representatives' views. They say that at recent
20 informational High-Speed Rail meetings, basic questions
21 were asked about potential impacts and we're told that the
22 first step is identifying a preferred route. For these
23 residents, understanding the impact to their communities
24 should be the first step.

25 I'm very concerned that adopting a preferred

1 route prior to identifying funding for these existing HSR
2 construction. I strongly urge you go delay adopting any
3 preferred route until the concerns identified above have
4 been resolved. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Correa.

6 Cindy Sower followed by Susan Lustig and then
7 Jean Laird.

8 MS. SOWER: Hello.

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good morning.

10 MS. SOWER: Hello, California High-Speed Rail
11 Board. I'm Cindy Sower. I'm President of the Sun Valley
12 Area Neighborhood Council and I represent my neighborhood
13 council and the voices of the Sun Valley Community. I am
14 delivering a letter, or actually I already have. I sent it
15 to you via email and I saturated you this morning.

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Great.

17 MS. SOWER: Dated November 13th, 2018. It
18 represents our entire Board. We voted not to support
19 routes E1 or E2 and we very narrowly voted to not support
20 Route SR14, coming aboveground through our Sun Valley
21 community along San Fernando Road towards Burbank.

22 With this letter, you will find supporting
23 letters from our elected officials: City Council Member
24 Nury Martinez for CD6, Council Member Paul Krekorian for
25 CD2, State Senator Bob Hertzberg, Congressman Tony

1 Cardenas, Assemblywoman Luz Rivas. Our elected officials
2 question this route and do not support any aboveground
3 routes.

4 Along with this our neighborhood council voted to
5 approve submitting a community impact statement to support
6 Council File 180002-S124 filed October 9th, 2018. That was
7 presented by our very own Councilwoman Nury Martinez. The
8 resolution was against SR14 as it came through the
9 aboveground route through Sun Valley. Please accept this
10 documentation so that it becomes part of the record today.

11 In our community of neighborhood councils, this
12 vote aligns our Sun Valley Area Neighborhood Council with
13 the Foothill Trails Neighborhood Council, the Sunland-
14 Tujunga Neighborhood Council, as well as the Sylmar
15 Neighborhood Council whom have all gathered here today to
16 come together as a community.

17 The Sun Valley Area Neighborhood Council does not
18 support any of your routes and objects to your project. It
19 is unfounded, too expensive and far too destructive to our
20 communities.

21 Now, I just have one more sentence. I want to
22 remove my neighborhood council hat and I'm going to put on
23 my personal one. Now I've removed that hat. November is a
24 difficult month for me. I've lost my grandparents, my
25 father, my mother, all from this very same community, all

1 in November. So I'm wearing black, because if you go
2 through with this vote and you vote in SR14 it's as if I
3 lose my home town as I know it.

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I'm sorry.

5 Susan Lustig followed by Jean Laird and then
6 Pamela Walter.

7 MS. LUSTIG: Should I give you this now?

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Would you please give it to
9 the Secretary over there? Actually, Ms. Boehm will take it
10 from you.

11 MS. LUSTIG: Oh, Michelle? Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Sorry. Thank you. Go ahead
13 and he'll distribute it to us.

14 MS. LUSTIG: Good morning, Mr. Chair and Members
15 of the Board.

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good morning.

17 MS. LUSTIG: My name is Susan Lustig and I've
18 lived in Sun Valley for 30 years.

19 Let me speak to the Sun Valley environmental
20 justice area that completely encompasses the SR14 Route.
21 As the train travels south, comes out of the tunnel at
22 Montague and goes aboveground along San Fernando Boulevard
23 before it goes back underground to Burbank.

24 Many businesses will be destroyed along San
25 Fernando due to the route going aboveground. Also, we

1 understand that the spoils from tunneling are earmarked for
2 Sun Valley. Once again Sun Valley becomes a trashcan to
3 the state's debris.

4 The Sun Valley Environmental Justice Improvement
5 Area was put into place by the City of LA, in 2005 since so
6 much of this area is active landfills, mining, car parts,
7 waste management and recycling businesses.

8 The term of environmental justice describes a
9 social movement that focuses on the fair distribution of
10 environmental benefits and burdens, fair distribution of
11 burdens. Why, once again does Sun Valley get the waste and
12 debris of a project? We are certainly not the ones getting
13 the multi-million dollar world class multi-modal
14 transportation hub, because that's going to Burbank.
15 Seventy percent of Sun Valley is Hispanic. Seventeen
16 percent live in poverty. It also ranks in the top 100
17 excess cancer goods for stationary source in the South
18 Coast Air Basin. Why must Sun Valley continually be the
19 state's dumping ground?

20 Now I hate to mention this, but if this train is
21 coming, if we have failed in stopping it, please set aside
22 at least \$100 million to build a world class city park to
23 go over where all the dirt and debris will be dumped. L.A.
24 deserves it, but Sun Valley has earned it. Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

1 Jean Laird, good morning, followed by Pamela
2 Walter and then Ruth Brock. Good morning.

3 MS. LAIRD: Good morning, thank you for letting
4 me speak. I'm coming from Acton representing the Acton-
5 Agua Dulce area. And for those of you who aren't familiar
6 with it, it's extremely different from down here in Burbank
7 and even Palmdale. It's a rural community. We don't have
8 the amenities that most of you do down here. But we chose
9 that lifestyle, because living in Acton truly is like
10 camping every day. That's the best way to describe it.

11 With that said, it's a very large equestrian
12 community. And previously you heard someone speak to the
13 safeness of the area with horses in mind. Most of us have
14 horses. Most of us are getting up there in age. A lot of
15 us are retired. And frankly, if it's not underground it's
16 going to have a detrimental effect on all of us who
17 basically live hand-to-mouth, because we feed our horses.
18 So we implore you to please consider the Acton-Agua Dulce
19 portion to be underground.

20 Secondly, the last thing is the elephant in the
21 room that we're concerned about is at one time this was an
22 \$8 billion project. It's now to \$80 billion. Where is
23 this money coming from? We want to know where this money
24 is coming from. Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

1 Pamela Walter followed by Ruth Brock and then
2 Mike O'Gara.

3 MS. WALTER: Good morning. Thank you for coming
4 down to Southern California, so that we could all get
5 ourselves here. I'm a little emotional. I'm not going to
6 read anything. Let me take a breath. I'm here today; my
7 husband is at home dying. He's terminally ill.

8 I've been following this project for ten years.
9 It is important to me that you protect my community of
10 Acton. I want it underground. I've toured with you, Mr.
11 Richard. I've showed you our community. You know what
12 we've got. We are 100 square miles of 7,500 people. It's
13 really important to us. I have worked diligently for all
14 the years that I've lived in Acton to build that school and
15 now you're 1,500 feet from our high school. We worked
16 hard.

17 I'm a retired realtor. I had to close my real
18 estate office recently, because of the progression of my
19 husband's illness. Come on guys. I need you here. I need
20 you supporting Acton. I know Michelle. I've talked to
21 Juan Carlos. I've talked to Rick. I am on the team to
22 make this correct for Acton and Aqua Dulce. That's why I'm
23 here today. My husband is with a caregiver, because I had
24 to come here and say my peace. That's it. Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

1 Ruth Brock followed by Michael O'Gara and then
2 Renee Renfro.

3 MS. BROCK: Thank you. My name's Ruth Brock and
4 I've lived in Acton for 26 years. I've had the honor and
5 pleasure of serving on the Acton Town Council for the past
6 18 months. The Council responds to all local, county and
7 state issues on behalf of our residents of Acton. Our
8 response is shaped by the guidelines adopted in the
9 Antelope Valley Town and Country Area Plan and the Acton
10 Community Standards. The AV Area Plan and the Acton
11 Community Standards both state that our community's goal is
12 to carefully plan development that will sustain Acton's
13 rural profile. Our residents look to us to help protect
14 their country lifestyle. Many of our Acton Town Council
15 Members and local residents are here today in an effort to
16 do just that.

17 The proposed High-Speed Rail staff recommended
18 Route SR14 will be a huge detriment to our town in so many
19 ways and a threat to the rural lifestyle we all treasure.
20 The proximity of the proposed aboveground route to our
21 local high school is frightening. In addition to possible
22 safety concerns, the noise it will create will be a
23 distraction not only to our students, but also the
24 surrounding homes anywhere near this aboveground track.

25 As the train enters and exits the tunnel that

1 goes underground in the Red Rover Mine area, there will
2 also be audible disturbance to surrounding residents.
3 Aesthetically, it will go against every plan in place for
4 Acton. The SR14 Route takes the train right under my home
5 that I have lived in for 26 years.

6 In my opinion, there is no route that has been
7 proposed that wouldn't cause great harm to the town of
8 Acton. But if the train must come, we are pleading with
9 you that it be a 100 percent underground as it passes
10 through our community. Thank you very, very much.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

12 Mike O'Gara then Renee Renfro and then Janet
13 Gibson.

14 MR. O'GARA: My name is Mike O'Gara. I've been a
15 resident of Sun Valley for 45 years. Where are the
16 community benefits in this project for Sun Valley? Where
17 are they? There's none. A long time ago I asked for a
18 light maintenance facility building to be built in Sun
19 Valley, at Branford and San Fernando Road. This would
20 provide permanent jobs for residents of Pacoima, Arleta and
21 Sun Valley. These are three of the most underserved
22 communities along the high-speed route.

23 What did we get? We're going to get a noisy
24 train, dividing our residents every six minutes. We got
25 nothing. We're going to get a construction site along a

1 busy road in Sun Valley that's going to disrupt our
2 businesses and put a lot of those businesses out of
3 business. They're going to go bankrupt. When you start
4 building those train crossings in our neighborhood you're
5 going to separate the businesses from the people, their
6 customers. They're going to lay off their people when they
7 get hurt moneywise. The people are not going to be able to
8 pay the rent. A lot of them are poverty. They work two
9 jobs to make ends meet. And they're going to wind up
10 homeless. We already have a huge homeless problem in Sun
11 Valley.

12 So once again, where is the community benefit for
13 us? Put this train underground and stop all this nonsense,
14 please. Thanks.

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

16 Renee Renfro then Janet Gibson then Josh Hertz.
17 Ms. Renfro?

18 MS. RENFRO: Hi. I am a long-time resident of
19 Acton, since 1977. The SR14 Route would cut through a
20 mountain gap on the west side of Acton. At this location
21 the tracks will be 160 feet above the entrance of Red Rover
22 Mine Road. The E1 and E2 routes involve a viaduct that
23 cuts across a mountain gap just to the San Gabriel
24 Mountains National Monument boundary where the tracks will
25 be elevated approximately 100 feet above Aliso Canyon Road.

1 It is expected that this configuration will
2 result in extensive bird strikes, because of the train will
3 be at an elevated platform at 220 miles per hour. Bird
4 strikes are a huge common problem with the high-speed
5 trains. Birds need to react within 450 feet of the train.
6 The Madrid line in Spain experiences 100 bird strikes per
7 mile, per year, through the tracks on this line, and
8 generally not elevated and the train speed is restricted to
9 approximately 180 miles per hour.

10 The Red Tail Hawk is what I'm worried about,
11 because this is where I grew up and -- (crying)

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Ms. Renfro, just take a
13 second. It's okay.

14 MS. RENFRO: If you knew what it was like growing
15 up you would understand how beautiful and how environmental
16 and how wildlife just runs through and you grasp on that.
17 And we grew as a community. But this will ruin everything
18 that we have fought, so hard for to stay as a community, to
19 stay as a closed community as possible. With this train,
20 it'll ruin everything we stand for, not only the noise, but
21 the animals. We will miss the hawks. We will see less
22 of lots of birds, because they'll be dead on the side of
23 the tracks. And we need them as much as they need us. And
24 you're killing wildlife.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Renfro.

1 Janet Gibson followed by Josh Hertz followed by
2 Charles Follette. Good morning.

3 MS. GIBSON: Good morning. Well, first thank you
4 for taking a moment to acknowledge the tragedies that are
5 affecting our state. Be it Thousand Oaks, Paradise,
6 Calabasas, Agoura, we're in trouble. And I want to read
7 you a very quick quote from Fortune Magazine of September
8 of this year.

9 "California's \$442 million fire budget is already
10 exhausted. It needs \$234 million more to keep fighting the
11 fires in California." This was as of September. How many
12 super scoopers at a cost of \$37 million could we buy with
13 your \$77 billion for a train that doesn't do anything to
14 help California survive; \$37 million for a super scooper.
15 We have to rent two of them, Quebec 1 and Quebec 2, from
16 Canada to come only during fire season, which we now know
17 no longer exists. Fire season is 24-7, 12 months a year in
18 California.

19 I want you to think about the people in Paradise
20 who no longer have a city, because we don't have the
21 ability to fight a fire in California the way that we
22 should. We could build an entire facility, centrally
23 located with super scoopers, the ability to take retardant,
24 water, whatever we need to put these fires out. They're
25 not stopping. Our Governor who supports his legacy project

1 himself has said we will continue to see these fires. But
2 what are we doing to suppress them? Nothing! What are we
3 doing to fight them? Nothing!

4 Instead, we're sitting here talking to you and I
5 do respect what you're doing, but I don't respect why. I
6 don't respect a legacy. I'm thinking about the people in
7 Paradise who've lost their lives, who've lost their
8 families, who've lost people they've known their entire
9 city. But who's next? Malibu was almost next. Calabasas
10 was almost next; \$77 billion goes a long way to fight
11 fires. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Gibson.

13 Josh Hertz, Charles Follette and then Janet
14 Lammon.

15 MR. HERTZ: Good morning. Thank you for holding
16 a meeting down here in Southern California. We appreciate
17 it. I'm here representing the Atwater Village Neighborhood
18 Council. We are a small sliver of the City of Los Angeles,
19 but we're bordered on either side by the Los Angeles River
20 and the rail right-of-way. So any changes to either draw a
21 lot of attention from our community. Today, I
22 would like to praise the efforts of the High-Speed Rail
23 Authority as our experience with dealing with your team has
24 been overwhelmingly positive. Initially, we were presented
25 with five construction options for grade separation, all of

1 which would have required homes be purchased in order to
2 complete.

3 Obviously, as a neighborhood council our primary
4 concern is with our neighbors. So any option that would
5 have led to our neighbors losing their homes was not
6 something we were prepared to accept. Michelle, Melissa,
7 Chelsea Dickerson who's been our primary point of contact
8 and their engineering team held multiple outreach meetings
9 with our neighborhood, some of which turned contentious.
10 And to the surprise of many of our residents, they actually
11 listened to our concerns.

12 Within a few months we were presented with a
13 grade separation option that required no residential
14 purchases, which is the option our Board of Governors has
15 officially supported. While we are aware there will be
16 more issues that arise if this project moves forward, we
17 are very confident that our concerns will be addressed in a
18 way that is beneficial to the health of both our
19 neighborhood and this project.

20 We greatly appreciate that the Burbank to L.A.
21 team has operated with honesty and integrity when it comes
22 to our neighborhood. And we look forward to future
23 cooperation as this project moves forward into its next
24 phase. Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

1 Charles Follette followed by Janet Lammon
2 followed by Jacqueline Ayer. And Mr. Follette, I am going
3 to have to hold you to the two minutes, so I'd ask you to
4 respect that. Thanks.

5 MR. FOLLETTE: That's fine. I was just editing
6 my talk, so that's fine. Yes, Chairman Richard and the
7 Board of Directors for the Authority my name is Charles
8 Follette. I am from Santa Monica. It is my hope that the
9 California Legislature and the California High-Speed Rail
10 Authority are successful in constructing and operating the
11 California bullet train from San Francisco to Los Angeles.

12 The primary difficulty in achieving this is the
13 segment from Bakersfield to Los Angeles. Much has been
14 written regarding the cost and time required to traverse
15 and tunnel through the Tehachapi and San Gabriel mountains,
16 to the point that many feel that Bakersfield may ultimately
17 be the final terminus to the south.

18 To ensure that Los Angeles is in fact in play,
19 it's time for the Authority to think outside the box. From
20 a geological, geographical, logistical and financial
21 standpoint there is an alignment that will enable the
22 completion of the project sooner than expected and under
23 budget.

24 Upon study, it is likely that the most logical
25 alignment to Los Angeles is the following southwest route.

1 Depart Bakersfield to the southwest through Maricopa and
2 Ventucopa to the junction of SR 33 and Lockwood Valley
3 Road. From here tunnel under the Los Padres National
4 Forest all the way to the SR 33 Freeway between Ojai and
5 Ventura at Casitas Springs. Parallel the freeway into
6 Ventura then head south along the established right-of-way
7 all the way to Los Angeles Union Station.

8 With the lower elevation gained (indiscernible)
9 within the Tehachapi route, the tunnel and tracks under the
10 Los Padres will have decreased percent grade at 2.5 percent
11 allowing for maximum train speeds of 220 miles an hour.
12 Because the train will travel under the forest it will have
13 no effect on the natural ecosystem aboveground. The
14 tunnels can be bored under a direct line of canyons running
15 north to south, not under ridges and summits.

16 This means shallower tunnels that enable
17 construction of escape routes at reasonable depths along
18 its entirety. The biggest difference and advantage of this
19 route is the geology. The Los Padres consists of
20 sedimentary rock. This makeup is much more suitable for
21 boring tunnels through the --

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
23 Follette. You have given us a written statement, which I
24 appreciate. We will read it.

25 MR. FOLLETTE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir. Janet Lammon
2 and then Jacqueline Ayer followed by Kelly is it Teno?

3 MS. LAMMON: Good morning Members of the Board.
4 I appreciate you being here and listening to all our
5 concerns. We obviously have a lot of them. I'm speaking
6 mostly from my heart. I really didn't write anything down,
7 because I know how I feel and I know what has been
8 presented to all of us.

9 My concerns are threefold. One of them is that
10 the high-speed rail is sort of obsolete after the Hyperlink
11 Air coming along. My other concern was the cost of the
12 ridership. And that was initially, when it was first
13 imported to all of us and we voted on that cost. And that
14 ridership cost and as building costs escalate, so do
15 ridership costs. Okay. So we have the issue of it being
16 obsolete. We have a big issue with the cost. I mean we
17 could use water desalination plants. We could on and on
18 with things that would be more beneficial to California
19 than high-speed rail.

20 And I am a big stakeholder. I have nine
21 properties that I don't want my property taxes paying for
22 the ridership or the maintenance of anything else of this
23 high-speed rail, so this is also a concern. But the cost
24 has been really expensive and continues without anything
25 being accomplished, which I'm really upset with all of our

1 Legislature for continuing to allow the money bleed.

2 As an individual, the High-Speed Rail runs just
3 hundreds of feet from the back of my property. All three
4 of my children grew up in Acton. We all, all citizens of
5 the United States and the world need quiet places. Thank
6 God so far, I live in Acton and it is still a quiet place.

7 And our three schools are below the SR14, which
8 with the valley fever and the spores and everything, I just
9 -- I don't know what else to say, but please consider
10 everything, please. Thank you very much.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. Jaqueline Ayer and
12 then Kelly -- is it -- am I mispronouncing your name?

13 MS. TENO: It's Teno.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Teno, I'm so sorry. Okay,
15 then Ms. Teno. Ms. Ayer?

16 MS. AYER: Thank you very much. My name is
17 Jaqueline Ayer. I am the Director of Engineering
18 Operations for Air Quality Specialists, an environmental
19 consulting firm in Orange County. I have a master's degree
20 in mechanical engineering from UC Berkeley and a bachelor's
21 degree in physics from Vassar.

22 Before I start my formal comments, I just want to
23 say I was struck by something Mr. McLoughlin said just a
24 short while ago. He said it's especially important to
25 mitigate or reduce impacts in urban areas. What an

1 extraordinary statement, coming from a man who's
2 responsible for environmental studies for the High-Speed
3 Rail Authority. I'd like to remind the High-Speed Rail
4 Authority that CEQA demands that you mitigate impacts
5 everywhere, urban and rural communities. So please, going
6 forward, keep that in mind.

7 I'm here today on behalf of SAVE OUR RURAL TOWN.
8 Earlier today I submitted comments electronically on behalf
9 of SORT, SAVE OUR RURAL TOWN. Here is a paper copy. And I
10 ask that it be included in the record. Thank you very
11 much, Michelle. I ask it be included in the administrative
12 record, the NEPA record and the CEQA record. These
13 comments address a myriad of issues and concerns, including
14 noise impacts, wildlife and domestic animal impacts, air
15 quality impacts, health and safety concerns and other
16 issues.

17 Of primary concern is the way noise impacts are
18 assessed. The methodologies employed in prior
19 environmental studies do not comply with CEQA or NEPA,
20 because they do not properly consider noise impacts at the
21 time and place where they occur. SORT asks that you report
22 actual project noise impacts and adopt thresholds of
23 significance that properly consider noise impacts on
24 historically quiet rural areas.

25 It is also important to note the CEQA imposes a

1 higher burden than NEPA and it obligates the Authority to
2 avoid impacts if it is feasible to do so. SORT contends
3 that undergrounding routes through Acton will eliminate all
4 noise, wildlife, animal, aesthetic and health and safety
5 impacts and it only increases tunnel lengths by less than 4
6 percent. So undergrounding in Acton is not economically
7 infeasible. That's why SORT seeks an underground
8 alternative and furthermore points out that CEQA demands
9 the consideration of such an alternative.

10 So I look forward to seeing an underground
11 alternative in the Draft EIR when it comes out. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you Ms. Ayer.

13 Ms. Teno I apologize for mispronouncing your
14 name.

15 MS. TENO: Don't worry about it. It happens all
16 the time.

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Well, people put an "s" on my
18 name all the time, so I get that. You'll be followed by
19 followed by Lorraine Diaz from Councilmember Krekorian's
20 office who was a late arrival. Please go ahead.

21 MS. TENO: Okay. Good afternoon. My name is
22 Kelly Teno. And I'm a resident of Acton and a member of
23 the Acton Town Council. The HSR will have a lasting effect
24 on our community, no matter which route is chosen. I'm
25 here today to speak about one facet of noise impacts, which

1 will greatly affect my own family, because we are close to
2 the proposed out-of-ground section on the SR14 Route.

3 While there is no objection to the CHSRA's use of
4 24-hour averaging methodology to assess and direct noise
5 impacts, such as methodologies included in Ldn, relied upon
6 by the FRA manual. However, if CHSRA uses a 24-hour
7 averaging methodology to assess and direct noise impacts
8 then the threshold criteria used to determine the
9 significance of such an impact must comply with CEQA.

10 CHSRA's prior environmental documents have failed
11 in this regard, because they all relied upon thresholds of
12 significance set forth in the NEPA-based FRA manual.
13 Specifically Figures 3-1 and 3-2, which are
14 insufficient for the purposes of CEQA and are inapplicable
15 to quiet rural communities, because among other reasons
16 they are based solely on noise studies conducted in urban
17 areas.

18 As explained in the technical assessment provide
19 in Attachment B the noise impact criteria embodied in
20 Figures 3-1 and 3-1, of the FRA manual are
21 inapplicable to quiet rural areas and therefore cannot be
22 relied upon for assessing noise impacts within the quiet
23 rural community of Acton. CHSRA is obligated to develop
24 non-urban noise impact criteria that are applicable to
25 quiet rural areas where existing ambient noise levels are

1 below 60 dba. This criterion must be developed and vetted
2 before any CEQA or NEPA documents are developed for the
3 Palmdale to Burbank HRS section.

4 In closing, I ask that you do the right thing and
5 protect the quiet rural community of Acton by giving us a
6 fully underground route. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Teno.

8 Lorraine Diaz followed by Barbara Harris, I
9 believe it is, and then Nancy Crosby. Ms. Diaz, you're
10 representing Councilmember Krekorian, I understand?

11 MS. DIAZ: That's correct. Thank you. I'd like
12 to read a letter that Councilmember Krekorian wrote to the
13 Board. I just actually, sorry, I apologize. I didn't know
14 I was supposed to give it to this guy.

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: We actually have his letter.

16 MS. DIAZ: Oh, okay. Then I'll just -- thank
17 you. So on behalf of Councilmember Paul Krekorian, L.A.
18 City Councilmember Krekorian, I'd like to read this letter.

19 "In 2016, I introduced a motion to the Los
20 Angeles City Council, and discussed with High-Speed Rail
21 Authority staff, my opposition to all aboveground routes
22 proposed in the City of LA, portions of the San Fernando
23 Valley. I remain opposed to High-Speed Rail traveling at
24 ground level in the Valley, as I believe it would
25 negatively impact residents, businesses and the

1 environment.

2 "Although none of the aboveground portions of the
3 proposed route are located in Council District 2, I hope
4 that you will listen to and work with my colleagues who
5 represent those areas to avoid harming these Los Angeles
6 communities.

7 "The High-Speed Rail Authority has shown a
8 willingness to engage with elected officials and Valley
9 residents in the past, proposing a completely subterranean
10 tunneled route in my district that will avoid all
11 aboveground construction leaving residential neighborhoods
12 in my district untouched and avoiding the Valley's
13 environmentally sensitive sites, demonstrated that the
14 High-Speed Rail Authority can be responsive to the wishes
15 of our communities as did the agreement to keep the
16 crossing at Arvilla Avenue, not too far from here, open in
17 order to allow access to businesses along San Fernando
18 Road.

19 "Please give the same consideration to residents
20 and businesses outside my district that are seeking to
21 avoid the impacts of aboveground construction contemplated
22 in your selected Preferred Alternative. Although that
23 route is simply a preliminary draft, keeping the Valley
24 sections underground will avoid unnecessarily disrupting
25 the area. Very truly yours, Councilmember Krekorian."

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much.

2 Barbara Harris, I believe it is, unless I'm
3 misreading this?

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible.)

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Barbara is going to
6 pass, so then you must be Nancy Crosby?

7 MS. CROSBY: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. And Ms. Crosby, you'll
9 be followed by Dale Gibson.

10 MS. CROSBY: Well, I apologize if much of what I
11 have to say is repeating what many have already. But I do
12 appreciate having a moment to give my personal thoughts.

13 I'm 69. I own horses and live on a well and I'm
14 in Acton and much of the community of Acton around my area
15 live with similar circumstances. I live back on Canyon
16 Road, which going -- my house is going to be about a half-
17 a-mile away from where SR14 Route goes, which means it
18 would have a significant impact on my daily life.

19 I would just like to also make the request, as
20 many have, that it be put underground. Between my horses
21 and concerns about -- well, let me say Acton has a lot of
22 issues regarding wells and water availability and whatnot.
23 And putting it aboveground I gather would impact that more
24 significantly than underground from what I've heard. You
25 know, without water you have nothing. So if that is in

1 fact a case that going belowground would be helpful in that
2 regard, I would certainly appreciate it.

3 And I just want to thank you for coming and
4 listening and please consider how these things will impact
5 our lives.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Crosby.

7 MS. CROSBY: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Dale Gibson followed by is it
9 Pat Kramer and then Dale Bybee, it looks like.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He left.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Dale Gibson left, okay. Is it
12 Pat Kramer?

13 MS. KRAMER: Yes, it is.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes.

15 MS. KRAMER: Thank you all for coming. My name
16 is Pat Kramer. I'm a long-time resident of Sunland-Tujunga
17 and a community volunteer. I am also an environmentalist.
18 I believe in preserving what environment we have. I moved
19 to Sunland-Tujunga 23 years ago, because of the Angeles
20 Forest. We have a community that is known for pure air,
21 due to the location by the San Gabriel Mountains. It is an
22 area where we've traditionally had facilities for people
23 with asthma and a long time ago, tuberculosis. The air
24 quality is very pure.

25 Our section, if you go forward with this plan is

1 going to be affected by the boring through the mountains.
2 The air quality will be affected.

3 Regardless of what you heard in the presentation,
4 I want to say that your speakers are very practiced and
5 they speak very well, but do they speak the truth? I've
6 seen a lot of avoidance. For one thing, in their public
7 outreach presentation in September or October, at the
8 Angeles Golf Club I asked a question. I submitted a public
9 comment. It was never taken up. It was not responded to
10 and even though we were told that all of our questions
11 would be responded to via email I never got a response.
12 And I am on your email list. I get responses from you, so
13 I want to say that they don't follow through as they say
14 they do.

15 I'm very concerned about the air quality and also
16 concerned about the water quality. If you are tunneling
17 through the Angeles Forest, you are going to affect our
18 water. And as we know, if we don't have water this state
19 is going to dry up and it's going to be uninhabitable. Our
20 water comes down through the mountains from the Sierras.
21 It comes right through Sunland-Tujunga where it's purified
22 underground. If you are boring through the mountains,
23 you're going to cross those waters. And we're not going to
24 be able to count on pure water and drinkable water.

25 So I want you to just think about the comments

1 you heard from our state and city representatives who have
2 all stated opposition. They represent us. I'm asking you
3 to not approve this plan today. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

5 Dale, is it Bybee?

6 MR. BYBEE: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Followed by Gary, it looks
8 like Agius (phonetic) and then Katherine Paul.

9 MR. BYBEE: Good afternoon.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good afternoon, sir.

11 MR. BYBEE: I live up Red Rover. Red Rover is
12 two-and-a-half miles long. The project for the High-Speed
13 Rail is at the entrance that serves as the only ingress and
14 egress to that property.

15 Recent fires show the importance and the dangers
16 of single entrants and ingress and egress, 80 percent of
17 the breeze throughout the year travels up that canyon. And
18 the Red Rover Mine Road name is derived from the mine that
19 is still in existence. Historical photos and written
20 documentation reveal there were cyanide pits at the area
21 where the construction is taking place. This photo is from
22 1911. And it represents the cyanide pits that at the base
23 of the construction. A breeze would certainly carry the
24 dust up the canyon. Red Rover Mine is an active mine or
25 they've tried to start the mine up again. But it's been

1 stopped by local and state government, yet the state is
2 moving forward with an epic mining project of its own.

3 When the community met with various members of
4 the High-Speed Rail, your engineers at the time claimed to
5 have no engineered study for the train to go underground in
6 Acton. And you want the people of California to believe
7 that miles before and miles after Red Rover and billions of
8 dollars sorry, that you have not taken the time or
9 consideration to engineer less than 5,000 feet. It is
10 aboveground in Acton. Those were the words from your
11 engineers and the people that we met with in the community
12 center.

13 Just in closing, if I can, the claim to this
14 benefit or the progress just briefly reminds me of a C.S.
15 Lewis quote: "Of all the tyrannies, a tyranny sincerely in
16 exercise for the good of its victims may be the most
17 oppressive. It would be better to live under robber barons
18 than under omnipotent moral busy bodies, the robber barons
19 cruelty may sometimes sleep. His stupidity may at some
20 point be sedated. But those who torment us for our own
21 good will torment us at end for they do so with approval of
22 their own conscience." Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Bybee. Gary
24 Agius followed by Katharine Paull. Sir, I hope I didn't
25 mispronounce your name and then Susan Stedman.

1 MR. AGIUS: Again, it happens a lot. I'm Gary
2 Agius, a Sun Valley resident for 71 years off and on, but
3 in Sun Valley. A comment of the CHSRA has made no
4 provisions or directions for people who cannot attend this
5 meeting today, to the best of my knowledge. They have
6 scheduled the meeting at 8:30 a.m. on a working day. A lot
7 of people can't do that or can't come in here on this day.
8 So I would hope that you would address that.

9 You have learned today and in the past that a
10 miniscule number of people in the San Fernando Valley and
11 Acton and even Palmdale do not approve of any of the
12 routes. They've been unacceptable to me from the
13 beginning. There are other routes possible. You heard of
14 one today. I urge you to explore other routes. It's just
15 not going to work out in my estimation.

16 And as far as Sun Valley goes, it's the longest
17 distance that you've got right now with route SR14. You
18 come out for like 12 miles, right through Sun Valley, cut
19 us right down the middle. And it's going to disrupt
20 businesses during construction and after. The roads are
21 going to be more unnavigable than they are now.

22 So if you do have to go with SR14, please put it
23 underground all the way through Sun Valley. I know there's
24 geological problems with that, but this is a monumental
25 project. And if you're going to do it, you've got to do it

1 right. So thank you very much.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

3 Katharine Paull followed by Susan Stedman
4 followed by Dave DePinto.

5 MS. PAULL: I'm Katharine Paull. I live in Kagel
6 Canyon. Just as I expect transparency, integrity,
7 responsibility, honesty and justice in my friendships, as a
8 taxpayer and citizen I also expect those values from a
9 government that is meant to serve its citizens. Instead, I
10 find a bureaucracy that puts business ahead of the people
11 it should be serving. Instead of integrity, I find greed
12 and ignorance. Instead of transparency, I see a lack of
13 environmental justice necessary for people who may be most
14 affected by this project and who should informed in clear
15 language about impacts that cannot or will not be
16 mitigated. Instead of responsibility, I've seen people in
17 the Central Valley lose homes and property. They are
18 losses, which in the long run might not even have been
19 needed. Instead of honesty, I've seen the Mineta Equine
20 Desktop Study substitute for legitimate research in our
21 area as well as dependence on international expertise, as a
22 substitute for geotechnical knowledge of the San Gabriel
23 Mountains. Instead of justice, I see unrealistic
24 projections of High-Speed Rail costs and ridership income
25 from a project that looms well into the future.

1 What passenger at the Burbank Station would
2 choose to pay more money on a two-and-a-half hour train
3 ride over a one-hour plane trip? I see citizens in limbo
4 frustrated as they are ignored by a government that is
5 meant to service, not oppose their basic needs. We deserve
6 better.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

8 Susan Stedman and Dave DePinto then Cindy Bloom.

9 MS. STEDMAN: Susan Stedman, Shadow Hills. Until
10 the revised E2 route was announced my retirement home was
11 an eminent domain target. We were devastated as we feared
12 we would lose everything we had worked so hard to attain.
13 I fully empathize with those businesses and communities who
14 are now living in the crosshairs of the Preferred
15 Alternative.

16 We don't feel any homeowner or business ought to
17 be threatened by or displaced by this project. We view
18 this as a regional project, the impacts of any of the
19 proposed routes go far beyond the immediate location of the
20 tracks, trains and wires. The entire northeast San
21 Fernando Valley is impacted by each of the proposed routes
22 if they come aboveground in any way.

23 I was speaking first, so that another major issue
24 is brought to the attention of the Board. And that is, how
25 we've been treated as communities. Chairman Richard, you

1 and your staff took a tour with us and actually visited my
2 home and property to view the Big Tujunga Wash. We've sent
3 you and your staff hundreds of letters. We've encountered
4 you and your staff at various Board meetings. We have
5 found you all to be less than responsive, lacking in
6 empathy and less than truthful in your dealings with us.

7 I will play audio from the Board's Meeting in
8 Downtown LA, where you promised us, and several of our
9 elected officials, that this Board Meeting would be held
10 nearer to our communities and before the Preferred
11 Alternative was announced. Once you listen to the
12 recording, you'll understand why we don't trust the
13 Authority. They have turned a deaf ear to us. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

15 Dave DePinto, followed by Cindy Bloom.

16 (Audio recording begins to play.)

17 MR. DEPINTO: This is still her time. Excuse me,
18 I'm sorry.

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I'm sorry?

20 MR. DEPINTO: It's still her time.

21 MS. STEDMAN: It's still my time.

22 (Audio Recording playing.)

23 "CHAIRMAN RICHARD: -- (indiscernible) Supervisor
24 Archer as well as Councilwoman Rodriguez, I've committed
25 that before we do have a decision, even a decision on an

1 intermediate step like a selection of a preferred alignment
2 path for further analysis, that meeting of this Board would
3 occur in your communities somewhere in the San Fernando
4 Valley."

5 (Audio Recording ends)

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, because I actually
7 appreciate you playing that. Thank you. Mr. DePinto, go
8 ahead. I believe that's exactly what we're doing. Mr.
9 DePinto followed by Cindy Bloom, followed by Gerri Summe.

10 MR. DEPINTO: Because of that statement we
11 officially declare this meeting to be a fake meeting,
12 Chairman Richard. This meeting is a disservice to the
13 Board and our communities. It's not the meeting we asked
14 for. It's not the meeting you promised. Burbank is not
15 the northeast San Fernando Valley. This location is miles
16 away from the 300,000 people who will be negatively
17 impacted.

18 This location, Board Members, and these routes
19 and these communities are profoundly different than
20 anywhere else you've been in the State of California and
21 you need to see them with your own eyes. And that's what
22 we've been asking for, for years. This meeting limits
23 public participation and creates a wrong impression for you
24 as Board Members about the level of concern and opposition
25 in our communities.

1 This meeting prohibits thousands of residents.
2 We're just community leaders representing them. But you're
3 preventing thousands of residents from speaking to you
4 directly. We learned about this location last week, from
5 the Holiday Inn staff before we learned about it from the
6 High-Speed Rail staff. Your Preferred Alternative and
7 continued study of E1 and E2 are unconscionable.

8 You are keeping us hostage. It's already been
9 four years. And your ignoring our consistent message,
10 which you have heard over and over today, which is we will
11 not accept aboveground high-speed trains in or near densely
12 populated areas or sensitive environmental areas. You've
13 heard from many elected officials today. You've heard from
14 several neighborhood councils. We have four or five
15 community nonprofit organizations here as well. We are a
16 united front and we are a wall. We will not bend and we
17 will not break.

18 So my advice and recommendation to this Board
19 today, in terms of action and it relates to moving forward
20 on the Preferred Alternative E1 and E2, if you are going to
21 move forward please commit that you will only move forward
22 with all of those routes featuring only underground buried
23 segments, otherwise those routes be removed from further
24 study.

25 We have lived with the threat for four years.

1 Your EIRs are not going to be done for another three to
2 five years. And we're tired of the threat.

3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

4 MR. DEPINTO: And Board Members and staff, if you
5 don't bury these routes, we will. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you Mr. DePinto.

7 Cindy Bloom, followed by -- I hope I'm not
8 mispronouncing, is it Gerri Summe?

9 MS. BLOOM: Gerry Summe is her name. Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes. Okay. I didn't mess
11 that up.

12 MS. BLOOM: Okay. When does the timer start?

13 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes. Go ahead.

14 MS. BLOOM: Cindy Bloom, Shadow Hills. Prop 1A
15 and the 2018 Business Plan are fake. Prop 1A was fake.
16 Voters expected routes to follow freeway corridors. Voters
17 were told the cost would be 45 billion and that the non-
18 stop trip would be 2 hours and 40 minutes. The Business
19 Plan is fake and believe me I know a fake business plan
20 when I see one, because I've written fake business plans.

21 The *L.A. Times* just reported that the project
22 will likely go over budget another 11 billion. The daily
23 (indiscernible) rate used to be one million a day. Now it
24 will three million dollars a day. And just this morning,
25 hot off the press, a stinging audit report was released.

1 The funding sources are fake. In March 2016, Dan Richard
2 referred to surprise funding, the FAA reports are fake.
3 The inconsistencies on why routes were eliminated were
4 astounding.

5 For example, environmental concerns were cited
6 leading to eliminating 52 other alignments, but not SR14,
7 E1 and E2. Your claims of public and political support are
8 fake. Polls show the majority of voters no longer support
9 the project and our new Governor portends major changes.

10 Benefits to taxpayers are fake. Even though
11 Southern California has paid the majority of the state's
12 taxes, 98 percent of local improvement monies are being
13 spent in Northern and Central California.

14 Your objectives are fake. You will not meet
15 environmental and construction timelines, ridership levels,
16 speed and time requirements. The budgets have ranged from
17 16 billion to 100 billion. Your ridership projections for
18 2033 are 104,000 passengers per day. That's nine times
19 what Burbank Airport currently handles and it covers the
20 entire country. Don't you ever question staff's
21 recommendations? Is this the legacy you want to leave,
22 allowing the most expensive and mismanaged infrastructure
23 project in the history of our country to continue on its
24 trajectory to disaster? No corporation would tolerate such
25 fiscal recklessness.

1 In light of the above, it's premature and
2 imprudent for you, the Board, to render any decisions about
3 these route alternatives today. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Bloom.

5 Gerri Summe followed by Dale Stedman followed by
6 Liliana Sanchez.

7 MS. SUMME: Good afternoon Chairman Richard and
8 Members of the Board. Thanks for hearing us today. My
9 name is Gerri Summe and I'm a resident of Shadow Hills and
10 a member of SAFE, which stands for Save Angeles Forest for
11 Everyone. On September 11th, I had the good luck of
12 chatting with Gavin Newsome for about two minutes as he
13 responded to my accusation that he's waffled about the
14 train. He objected strongly and said three things: that
15 his position has always been consistent, that he doesn't
16 like your Business Plan, and that it's all about the money.
17 Welcome to our new Governor.

18 But for me and many Angelinos it's not all about
19 the money. There is just no need for this train. We don't
20 want the train, but no one is listening. Yes, it's about
21 the \$100 billion that the voters never consented to. But
22 it's also about the environment and the disregard for our
23 Angeles Nation Forest and its animals and our people.

24 Angelinos want to fly or drive to San Francisco,
25 not take the train. What we could use are local

1 improvements that help people commute within Los Angeles to
2 help the crippling traffic here, not to get us to Shafter
3 ASAP. No offense to the Shaftonians.

4 The entire announcement of a Preferred
5 Alternative gives us false comfort. We met with Michelle
6 Boehm a few weeks ago and it's clear that E1 and E2
7 continue to be studied. So we're still held hostage until
8 the route is finalized.

9 Environmental justice principles have been
10 unevenly applied and while patting yourselves on the back
11 for saving San Fernando, other areas like Lake View
12 Terrace, Pacoima and Sun Valley are still under
13 consideration.

14 Many claims about the train's benefits are just
15 false. Ridership projections, speeds, convenience and
16 ticket savings are overstated. Air quality improvements
17 and claims about the environmental break-even on this
18 project are highly questionable, strongly debated and
19 likely false.

20 Everyone talks about the three routes. And no
21 one ever mentions the fourth alternative. Just a reminder,
22 the fourth alternative is the No-Build option. Build San
23 Francisco to San Jose to the Central Valley and give Los
24 Angeles equal funds to fix our internal traffic problems,
25 which are horrendous, so that people can get to work.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Summe.

3 Dale Stedman followed by Lilianna Sanchez
4 followed by Kelly Decker. Mr. Stedman, good afternoon.

5 MR. STEDMAN: Good afternoon. My name is Dale
6 Stedman and I live in Shadow Hills. I'm a retired science
7 teacher who views noise as one of the major impacts that
8 the authorities cannot mitigate. Your noise studies will
9 not reflect the unique nature of sound and acoustics in our
10 area due to its unique topography and climate conditions.
11 Everyone in the northeast San Fernando Valley knows that on
12 any given day you can hear at the same time trains, planes,
13 construction and freeway noise.

14 The EIR will be based on proving via software
15 modeling, that the so-called Ldn value will not be
16 increased by a negotiable number of decibels. The Ldn is a
17 single number average over 24 hours. Since these trains
18 are not a continuous noise source, it is easy to prove that
19 the Ldn value will be low and not dramatically increased.
20 The Ldn value will falsely show that there is little noise
21 impact on our surrounding communities. This method of
22 tabulating decibel levels insults our intelligence. It is
23 the same method used at airports. Houses around airports
24 have an Ldn limit of 65 decibels, yet everyone is disturbed
25 by airport noise since each departing flight approaches 100

1 decibels.

2 The Ldn approach is deeply flawed. It's even
3 worse when one considers HSR. As the train exits the
4 tunnels it will produce a dramatic sonic boom, like a
5 military jet breaking the sound barrier. Some progress has
6 been made with European HSR projects in mitigating this
7 boom, but it's still there and terrifying to residents.

8 We are convinced the Authority cannot mitigate
9 the regional noise impacts resulting from aboveground train
10 operations. Any aboveground route is fatally flawed from a
11 noise standpoint due to our unique topography, climate
12 conditions and the densely populated northeast San Fernando
13 Valley. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

15 MS. SANCHEZ: Hello.

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Ms. Sanchez, good afternoon.

17 MS. SANCHEZ: Hi, good afternoon.

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: And let me just say you'll be
19 followed by Kelly Decker and then Lynne Toby. Please go
20 ahead.

21 MS. SANCHEZ: Okay, so I'm Lilianna Sanchez from
22 Sunland-Tujunga. And I want to say that the northeast San
23 Fernando Valley is currently and is too dense and too
24 highly developed to withstand impacts of the largest
25 infrastructure project in the United States.

1 The northeast San Fernando Valley is already over
2 developed with intensive infrastructure. Examples are
3 Burbank and Whitman airports, dozens of old landfills and
4 quarries, DWP power plants, existing Metrolink and Union
5 Pacific train traffic. The freeways, 5, 210, 170, the 118
6 freeways, they already impact and divide our communities;
7 the recent damages from the Station, Creek fires and La
8 Tuna fires and Currently the Woolsey fires that burned over
9 98,000 acres.

10 With information that you gave us today from your
11 staff recommendations, with information being made public
12 about relationship between utility infrastructure, power
13 lines and such fires it's unacceptable to introduce
14 electrified wires into the forest and through or above
15 tracks in our communities.

16 All of our communities with aboveground
17 suggestions, the character is going to be -- there will be
18 a huge impact. And our characters will be destroyed.

19 So for those waiting for the D/EIR, like the
20 Sierra Club, as I understand it you will not respect CEQA.
21 As I understand it, the aboveground and forest impacts
22 cannot be mitigated, so what are you waiting for? This is
23 no good. We don't want it. What we voted for is not what
24 we're getting. So we want this done. We want you to go
25 away and keep our communities safe.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

2 Kelly Decker then Lynne Toby then Dana Stangel.
3 Ms. Decker.

4 MS. DECKER: Kelly Decker, Kagel Canyon. Last
5 week, a California Black Bear was struck by a car on the
6 210 freeway, in Sylmar. He managed to drag his body to the
7 median strip, where he died of his injuries. The cause of
8 death was simple. Human encroachment and human caused
9 disasters have threatened the lands that were dedicated to
10 be preserved as home for California wildlife, forcing them
11 to go farther and farther out in search of food, water and
12 shelter.

13 It is unfathomable and unacceptable that we are
14 four years into this process and you still are not
15 considering a single route that does not go through the
16 Angeles National Forest. The damage to the forest cannot
17 be mitigated. Seven years of construction at the forest
18 floor, at the portals that are situated along the border of
19 forest lands will force the wildlife out of their homes,
20 what little habitat they have left and in search of safe
21 places that they will not find.

22 The animals that California is known for, that we
23 claim to love, the bear that's on our state flag for
24 heaven's sake, the mountain lion, the bobcat, the
25 California condor, which was just brought back from the

1 brink of extinction, all of these animals are threatened by
2 the train routes that you have designed. Some of them will
3 die, one way or the other, and for what? A train that no
4 one needs and that most of California no longer even wants.

5 The preservation, the sanctity of our national
6 forest, that either means something or it doesn't mean
7 something. The Kagel Canyon Civic Association and the over
8 750 residents that we represent remain opposed to all
9 alignments which damage the Angeles National Forest and
10 would unnecessarily threaten our wildlife and our water.

11 Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

13 Lynne Toby followed by Dana Stangel followed by
14 Eli Wells.

15 MS. TOBY: My name is Lynne Toby and I'm a
16 resident of Shadow Hills. And I want to welcome everyone
17 to the "Dan Richards Believe It or Not Show." (Laughter.)

18 If promises are made to be broken, this Board
19 gets a gold star in promise breaking. Despite the fact
20 that these routes have been and are continuing to be
21 presented in a very happy-happy joy-joy way, the facts
22 remain. We were promised a meeting in the northeast San
23 Fernando Valley. That's not Burbank. We know you're
24 geographically challenged, but we know where we are believe
25 it or not.

1 We were promised a meeting before the Preferred
2 Alternative was selected, another broken promise believe it
3 or not. We were promised a Board Meeting specifically to
4 discuss the Palmdale to Burbank section of the project,
5 didn't happen, believe it or not.

6 A phony equine impact study was performed.
7 Horses are flight animals and will react strongly to high-
8 speed rail. Choosing the Refined SR14 will not avoid all
9 the horse-keeping areas in the Palmdale to Burbank to Union
10 Station neighborhoods. The Mineta Study has also been
11 compromised by personal connections to the Board, believe
12 it or not.

13 You're not paying attentions to the conclusions
14 of your own hydro-geologic study, which states the risk of
15 tunneling in the forests and local mountains. I can't
16 believe that, but it's true. You're ignoring the
17 earthquake faults that affect anything built in this area
18 that's simply unbelievable, but true.

19 At a recent meeting, we were told that the train
20 would carry 20 million passengers a year. That's 54,795
21 trips per day, not adjusted for weekends. That's 3,044
22 trips per hour assuming it runs 18 hours a day, or 254
23 people per trip if they run every 5 minutes. Now if you
24 adjust the weekends and high and low ridership times of the
25 day, the trains will have to carry almost 1,000 passengers

1 per trip to make the 20 million figure a reality. That's a
2 pretty big promise, which I think is a pretty big lie. The
3 numbers just don't add up. But you're used to that by now,
4 believe it or not.

5 Sun Valley and Pacoima are already cities full of
6 industrial businesses, which generate toxic waste and noise
7 pollution. Where's the environmental and social justice
8 for these residents? And since you're all paid by the
9 state and federal funds, you work for us, not the other way
10 around. And it's time for you to start keeping your
11 promises, believe it or now.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

13 Dana Stangel followed by Eli Wells followed by
14 Charlie Bradley.

15 MS. STANGEL: Hi. So you've started off this
16 meeting asking us to be respectful of you guys and I
17 appreciate that. But watching snickering and gesturing
18 behind is hard to watch, I have to say.

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Well, I'm not aware of any of
20 that.

21 MS. STANGEL: You are not. I am the President of
22 the Sunland-Tujunga Neighborhood Council. We represent
23 about 55 to 60,000 people. And we passed a Community
24 Impact Statement in September of 2018, which read that our
25 Board voted unanimously to amend its opposition to the

1 Refined E2 Alignment for the California High-Speed Rail
2 Authority's Palmdale to Burbank project segment and any
3 other alignments that would cross any natural segments of
4 the L.A. River and its tributaries, including the Big
5 Tujunga Wash at or above grade within the City of Los
6 Angeles.

7 When I'm not the president of the neighborhood
8 council, I do local native wildlife education here. I
9 represent the Angeles National Forest today, and the
10 diverse wildlife that calls it home. I'm here to let you
11 know that we are not letting up. We voted for a high-speed
12 rail that would follow previously existing traffic
13 corridors. I just want to say that again, previously
14 established traffic corridors.

15 We did not vote for a high-speed train to come
16 barreling through our last bit of open space in the area.
17 In fact, I strongly believe that if we were to redo that
18 vote today, given everything the High-Speed Rail Authority
19 has and has not done, it would not pass.

20 Introducing a new transportation corridor to Sun
21 Valley? Did anyone ask Sun Valley what they thought? They
22 didn't approve that. And I can't imagine anyone approving
23 an EIR that does anything over, under or through the
24 Tujunga Wash, which is a mitigation area.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much.

1 MS. STANGEL: We have spent the past few years
2 battling intense fires in the area, fires that were made
3 worse because of bad development decisions. It's time to
4 rethink where we are developing and what we are paving
5 over. No over, no under and no through our Angeles
6 National Forest. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

8 Eli Wells. Mr. Wells, you'll be followed by
9 Charlie Bradley and Penelope McMillan, I believe it is.
10 Mr. Wells, please go ahead.

11 MR. WELLS: Thank you. Good afternoon.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good afternoon, sir

13 MR. WELLS: My name is Eli Wells. And I'm the
14 President of the Lake View Terrace Improvement Association.
15 And I'm here representing more than 12,000 residents of the
16 Lakeview Terrace community. And our message to you is the
17 high-speed rail construction will directly and adversely
18 impact our beautiful community of Lake View Terrace. So we
19 say emphatically, no to the rail.

20 We have the beautiful view, the horse trails,
21 Hansen Dam, the Discovery Cube, the beautiful hills, the
22 golf course. We are a very diverse community consisting of
23 various ethnic groups, with a larger concentration of
24 Latino and African American. We are proud of our diversity
25 and are united firmly against alternative routes for the

1 high-speed rail. The proposed routes would create visual
2 blight by having elevated train tracks visible to the
3 community and create environmental pollution and noise
4 pollution detrimental to our residents, our schools, our
5 businesses, our churches and our residents.

6 And by boring the underground railways, both
7 aboveground and belowground, are not welcome here in our
8 community; the aboveground being Lake View Terrace, Tujunga
9 Wash, the belowground being Pacoima, Sylmar. And so with
10 the SR4 as a preferred alternative the High-Speed Rail
11 Authority is violating environmental justice principles by
12 not removing E2 route from further consideration. And it
13 also violates the same principles with the SR14 as the
14 Preferred Alternative Route.

15 The environmental justice, approved by Jeff
16 Morales, Chief Executive Officer as I read it was adopted
17 to "mitigate" adverse disproportionate impacts,
18 particularly on minority and low-income populations.

19 So we just ask, we believe they are significant
20 adverse impacts on our community and with the large
21 percentage of minorities, we would ask that you would hear
22 our voice. Please consider other routes and other options.
23 Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Wells.

25 Charlie Bradley and then Penelope McMillan

1 followed by Thomas Dorsey. Good afternoon, sir.

2 MR. BRADLEY: Good morning or afternoon now yeah.
3 My name is Charlie Bradley. And I am the 1st Vice
4 President for the Sunland-Tujunga Neighborhood Council.
5 This is an elected position, so I am here today to do that
6 which I was elected. And that is to advocate for the
7 people. The biggest disappointment in some elected
8 officials and entities like yours is the blatant disregard
9 for the will of the people. So I implore you to take heed
10 to all of the opposition that you faced for the entirety of
11 this process.

12 Aside from the fact that it is absurd that we
13 would invest tens of billions of dollars to connect two
14 cities that are an hour apart, but any proposal that sends
15 high-speed rail above, through or beneath the Angeles
16 National Forest should not even be a consideration. So
17 there's a motto for those in opposition to this whole
18 debacle that says don't railroad us. So if you insist upon
19 ignoring the will of the people, than that is exactly what
20 you will be doing.

21 It is unfathomable to think that any
22 consideration for a project like this would go through the
23 communities of Beverly Hills or Brentwood or Hollywood or
24 Malibu or Santa Monica. And I'm here today to tell you
25 that we're going to fight you every day to keep it out of

1 our community too. You're not going to railroad us.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

3 Penelope McMillan followed by Thomas Dorsey
4 followed by is it Mark Wilcher? I'm sorry.

5 MS. MCMILLAN: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Did I get Ms. McMillan right?

7 MS. MCMILLAN: Yes. Thank you. Mr. Chairman and
8 the Board, I'm Penelope McMillan.

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Ms. McMillan, why don't you
10 pull the microphone down just a little bit so we can record
11 it.

12 MS. MCMILLAN: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

14 MS. MCMILLAN: How's that?

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Go ahead.

16 MS. MCMILLAN: Okay. I'm a resident of Sylmar,
17 which is a northeast valley community of about 80,000
18 people. I share the regional concerns that have been
19 expressed here before about the noise pollution, traffic,
20 wildlife impacts of all the aboveground features of the
21 proposed routes. However, I'm also concerned about the
22 underground component, because I live in Sylmar. And your
23 refined SR14 will tunnel under about 1,000 homes in Sylmar.

24 This is a place with complex geology with many
25 fault lines, many known fault lines and naturally occurring

1 gasses such as methane. Sylmar will never forget the June,
2 1971 tunnel explosion that killed 17 people, because of
3 high concentrations of methane along fault lines.

4 People here all morning have been referring to
5 underground tunneling, as it's some kind of panacea. But
6 as Sylmar would know, there are risks, there are dangers.
7 And I fear that the Authority will not be able to mitigate
8 them. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, ma'am. Thomas
10 Dorsey and then Mark Wilcher, I hope it is, and then Maria
11 Elena Rico. Sir?

12 MR. DORSEY: Welcome and thanks for this meeting.

13 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: You might want to raise the
14 microphone then.

15 MR. DORSEY: Sure. I'm a travel publisher,
16 national, and also at Mineta Transportation Institute. And
17 I first want to just remind people what's at stake with
18 this project, because I hear a lot of negativity about the
19 project as a whole.

20 We can disagree about alignments. We can
21 disagree about how much tunneling and all of that. And I
22 do trust that the Board will get the tunneling part right.
23 However, keep in mind that if this project is not built,
24 California will require another north-south freeway and
25 more airport land takings. There's no getting around that

1 if we're in a state that's growing and we are growing. So
2 anybody that says this thing can't be done, there is no "no
3 build" option. We have to do this. We can argue about the
4 alignments. We can argue about the tunneling, but it has
5 to be done.

6 That said, my comment is about intermodality. I
7 haven't seen, heard enough about making the Burbank
8 intermodal station more intermodal and particularly
9 inviting the Metro Red Line to extend up to, because that
10 would be a great source of passengers coming into the new
11 Burbank replacement airport terminal area there. I know
12 it's going to be an underground station. But I haven't
13 heard anything about that. And I just want to see that in
14 the coming EIR/EIS. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

16 I think my next card is from Maris Elena Rico.

17 MR. WILCHER: Mark Wilcher is my name.

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I missed Mr. Wilcher. I'm so
19 sorry. Excuse me, sir. Mr. Wilcher, go ahead.

20 MR. WILCHER: I'd like to say good afternoon to
21 the Board. My name is Mark Wilcher. I'm President of the
22 Mountain Glen Two Home Owner's Association. I'd like to
23 begin by saying that if this was next week, Thanksgiving,
24 and you were sitting at my dining room table, you'd be
25 sitting directly over the real underground railroad that

1 we're talking about. It comes directly under my home and
2 many of my fellow residents. We live in Sylmar.

3 I'd like to read a letter addressed to you, Mr.
4 Richard, on behalf of the 317 homeowners of the Mountain
5 Glen II Home Owner's Association.

6 "We are writing to express our deepest concerns
7 about the proposed SR14 Alignment Route of the California
8 High-speed Rail. According to your latest map it will be
9 tunneled directly under our homes. We're at the 210 and
10 the 118. We are concerned that the decision to tunnel
11 underneath our community as opposed to running the train at
12 or aboveground will not eliminate the adverse impacts such
13 a project will have on our homeowners."

14 Decreased property values, I bought this home in
15 the year 2000. It is my wife's dream home. Please don't
16 make it a haunted house. It's important. I want you to
17 remember that. Increased potential and adverse health
18 effects -- I have asthma. I'd hate to have to listen and
19 breathe in the dust, potential for contamination, negative
20 impact on the quality from the dust. Vibrations, again if
21 you were sitting at my dining room table we would be like
22 this. Okay? Potential harm and years of construction, not
23 only count the venting that has to go on in order to build
24 this project, it's going to come up directly in my front
25 yard -- directly adjacent to the pool and the community.

1 This cannot happen.

2 And if any of you are concerned about the
3 greatness of our state and our community, please step up,
4 make the right decisions and be accurate about what they
5 are.

6 For your experts and I quote, "lowest risk, least
7 amount of spoil, national monuments, avoids cultural
8 resources, foster and faster transportation, protecting
9 resources, value engineering, whatever that is; railroads,
10 talking to one another, and not one of your experts
11 mentioned anything about us.

12 Please, step up, make the right decisions. I
13 appreciate your time. I'd like this letter added to your
14 formal record.

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes. We'll take that, Mr.
16 Wilcher. I apologize again for skipping over you before,
17 but thank you for your comments.

18 Ms. Rico followed by Rebecca Colfer? Yes.

19 MS. RICO: Good afternoon. My name is Maria
20 Elena Rico and I too am a resident of the Mountain Glen II
21 or Mountain Glen Terrace community of Sylmar. I urge you
22 to reject the SR14 Palmdale to Burbank tunneling through
23 the San Gabriel Mountains. I am a long-time resident of
24 the Mountain Glen Terrace community adjacent to the Pacoima
25 Wash in Sylmar.

1 Tunneling under or adjacent to our community will
2 negatively impact our quality of life due to dust,
3 vibration, noise and an increased potential for adverse to
4 health. The current map shows the rail directly under my
5 street, directly under my house. And I'm not sure how you
6 would feel if you saw something going directly under your
7 house that would take years to build. We are next to 500
8 feet away from the tunnel that was -- that the explosion
9 that happened at a tunneling in Sylmar.

10 This project will also negatively affect the
11 Sybil Fields, which are baseball fields that are adjacent
12 to the Wash as well as El Cariso Park, which is the only
13 green space that is available to a vast section of Sylmar,
14 which is all houses and pavement.

15 As a homeowner, I am concerned with the potential
16 for condemnation and decreased property values. I am an
17 educator that has also worked in both Sun Valley and
18 Pacoima. I agree with previous speakers that these two
19 neighborhoods have long been the dumping ground for the
20 city and the state. Please consider the quality of life in
21 the northeast San Fernando Valley before you make your
22 decision. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

24 Rebecca Colfer and then Angelike Martin and then
25 Daniel Beltran.

1 MS. COLFER: Thank you Board for giving us this
2 time today. My name is Rebecca Colfer and I am a resident
3 of Acton, California. I reside there with my husband,
4 Sean, and my three teenage boys. They are -- you know my
5 husband actually grew up in Acton. And it has been our
6 dream since the day we were married to reside in Acton.
7 And we have realized that dream. So this is very
8 disturbing to us the way that this proposed Refined SR14
9 Route that has been proposed here today. Our teenaged sons
10 all attend a brand-new high school, Vasquez. My oldest son
11 is actually the first year that will graduate attending all
12 four years at our high school.

13 The high-speed rail, I mean I think one of our
14 biggest concerns as parents and I speak also from -- I am
15 also the Vice President of the PTSO there at Vasquez. And
16 I think our major concerns are that with over -- like Larry
17 King had said earlier, Superintendent King, he said that 20
18 trips per day with it just being a stone's throw from the
19 high school, that has kind of been brushed over I believe,
20 because I mean we're talking 90 decibels. And that is
21 incredibly loud for the children.

22 And that also -- a second point I'd like to point
23 out is something that has been addressed today a lot is the
24 animals, the effect on the animals. We are an agricultural
25 community. And there's so much wildlife and also

1 domesticated animals, large animals, horses, cows, I mean
2 you name it. There's also protected animals like the San
3 Diego Coast Horned Lizard and the California Red Legged
4 Frog, just to name a few. Both the California High-Speed
5 Rail Authority and FRA openly admit that there is virtually
6 no data that properly assesses the noise and vibration
7 impact of operating a train at 220 miles per hour in the
8 vicinity of animals, wild or domestic.

9 They also state clearly that the long-term
10 effects of the high-speed rail operation on animals
11 continues to be a matter of speculation and whether some
12 known responses represent a threat to survival of these
13 animals.

14 We have heard that the California High-Speed Rail
15 is obligated to fill this enormous data gap in addressing
16 the animal impacts before the draft environmental document
17 is prepared for the Palmdale to Burbank high-speed rail
18 segment, yet it has failed to do so. It needs to be vetted
19 by experts before preparing the CEQA or NEPA documents for
20 the Palmdale to Burbank segment. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Colfer.

22 Is it Angelike Martin? Yes. Is it Martin or
23 Martine?

24 MS. MARTIN: Martin.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Ms. Martin.

1 MS. MARTIN: Hello. My name is Angelike Martin
2 and I am a homeowner in Acton of three-and-a-half years.
3 We moved there, we have moved into our forever home from
4 the city. And I am so sad that this train, first of all,
5 is even planning on ruining California, but to ruin Acton.
6 If you could stand on our back porch and look at our view,
7 it is breathtaking. To think that it is going to be ruined
8 by a high-speed rail and go right past the high school that
9 my children proudly go to. I am the President of the
10 Vasquez High School PTSO, proudly serving this year as
11 president and I have fallen in love with this community and
12 everyone around it. I'd hate to see the peacefulness that
13 we have destroyed by this train going aboveground.

14 I would like to, and need to submit into record
15 that every aspect of the CHSRA's prior analysis of noise
16 and vibration impacts to wildlife and domesticated animals
17 is entirely speculative, because it is based solely on the
18 FRA's interim screening value of 100 dbas, which is in fact
19 contraindicated by the very data that it purports to
20 represent. That the CHSRA has improperly implemented with
21 the force and effect of an actual threshold of significant.

22 CHSRA is reminded that guessing whether that the
23 HSR project represents a threat to generalized animal
24 survival without data or analysis is not the standard that
25 is set by either CEQA or NEPA. CHSRA is obligated to fill

1 the enormous data gap in addressing the animal impacts
2 before a draft environmental document is prepared for the
3 Palmdale to Burbank route.

4 Please do not ruin my forever home that I have
5 waited my entire life to move into. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Martin.

7 Daniel Beltran followed by Dylan Lunde, I believe
8 it is, and then John Spanos.

9 MR. BELTRAN: Hi. Good afternoon, my name is
10 Daniel Beltran and I'm in Sylmar. I'm in the Mountain Glen
11 residential area, actually Mark's neighbor. And as I
12 understand it the tunnel's going to go under my property as
13 well. And I don't think you can blame me for being here to
14 oppose this concept.

15 I don't -- well, before I get to that I wanted to
16 bring to your attention some of the information that we
17 received today, at least part of the information. It was
18 on the table, it was in the Palmdale to Burbank project
19 section binder. Those were on the desk over there. We're
20 not to remove them from that table, but I wrote down I
21 believe it's Table 2 of page 21 when it talked about the
22 impacts. There was a graph of a doughnut shape, broken
23 into half of a doughnut shape, broken into three parts of
24 least favorable, favorable, most favorable.

25 The impact to the socio-economics and

1 communities: Single family residential displacements, SR14,
2 was least favorable; multifamily residential displacements,
3 least favorable; operational impacts, high to very high;
4 wildlife hazard zones, least favorable; impacts to
5 construction, impacts of construction pollutants, SR14,
6 least favorable; vibrations, least favorable; impact on
7 biological resources on wetlands, it's on page 22;
8 construction water usage, sorry I skipped, this is public
9 utilities; construction water usage, least favorable; the
10 special, this is biological resource impacts, special
11 status plant species, least favorable; listed wildlife
12 species, least favorable; this is still all SR14. Non-
13 listed wildlife species habitat, least favorable; non-
14 wetland waste of U.S., least favorable; riparian habitat,
15 lakes and stream beds, least favorable; paleontological
16 sensitivity, least favorable.

17 This is not looking good on the favorability
18 side. So I just wanted to say in closing a lot of things.
19 History is lettered with stories of things that had to be
20 done, for some reason this had to be done. There are a lot
21 of things that had to be done that we often look back on
22 and say the cost is too high and this is clearly one of
23 them. Ad I don't think this is a -- I'm sure there's more
24 to your -- what you bring to the table and better us than
25 them, but I just want you to please consider the burden

1 that we carry. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Beltran.

3 Dylan Lund and then John Spanos then John Lane or
4 Laue, I'm sorry.

5 MR. LUNDE: Hi, I'm Dylan Lunde.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Mr. Lunde, I'm sorry.

7 MR. LUNDE: That's fine, it happens all the time.

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Understood.

9 MR. LUNDE: I'm a 23-year resident of Acton,
10 California and a member of the Acton Town Council. And
11 there's clearly a lot of issues concerns and problems
12 associated with this project. I'm just going to bring up
13 one issue specifically. It appears that CHSRA has never
14 considered the extent to which the construction will
15 exacerbate existing Valley Fever concerns, in Acton and the
16 greater Antelope Valley, which are mapped and well known
17 Valley Fever hot spot areas.

18 At a recent community meeting, an Acton resident
19 described the devastating impact of the disease on his life
20 and it is both surprising and appalling that Valley Fever
21 has never been given any consideration in the environmental
22 documents prepared for HSR segments in the Central Valley,
23 which is also a mapped and well known Valley Fever hot spot
24 area.

25 While it is true that some percentage of

1 individuals exposed to the disease experience few ill
2 effects, those who are less fortunate experience permanent
3 debilitating health effects and often cannot afford
4 treatment, which costs thousands of dollars per month. And
5 the worst cases tend to occur in people with darker skin.

6 The disease is contracted when particulate that
7 carries Valley Fever spores is inhaled. And this can
8 happen any time spore-containing soil is disturbed via
9 grading, farming or any dirt-moving activity. Because the
10 spores multiply rapidly in warm and moist top soil, typical
11 dust control measures such as watering down construction
12 sites actually increase the incidents of Valley Fever.
13 Therefore, such dust control measures must not be used in
14 Acton, or anywhere in the Antelope Valley.

15 And SAVE OUR RURAL TOWN contends that CHSRA must
16 prepare a comprehensive Valley Fever Mitigation Plan,
17 specifically for the community of Acton that addresses all
18 the excavation work that will be done to construct the two
19 to three proposed tunnel entrances, the massively high dirt
20 berms that will extend considerable distances out from each
21 tunnel entrance, and all the excavation work that will be
22 done to construct the tracks between the tunnel entrances.

23 This is essential for the health and well-being
24 of Acton residents and students. Thank you for your time.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Lunde. I'm

1 going to come back to that comment afterwards. It's a very
2 important issue.

3 John Spanos followed by I guess is it John, is it
4 Lane or Laue?

5 MR. LAUE: Laue.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Laue, okay. Thank you, sir.

7 MR. SPANOS: Hell, Mr. Chairman.

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good afternoon.

9 MR. SPANOS: Hello. I'm also one of the
10 residents in the Mountain Glen II community that Mark
11 Wilcher represents as our home owners association
12 president. So I will skip some of the points that he
13 already made that I also had noted to make here, to save
14 time.

15 I do want to point out though that the two things
16 that were pointed out in the presentations early in the
17 morning, the first one was to avoid and the second was to
18 minimize the impact on residential communities. Well, they
19 actually managed to maximize the impact to our community.
20 So if they painted a target on our back, they hit it dead
21 center. They really killed us with this SR14 Alignment.

22 All right, so Mr. Chairman your first question
23 just before the Q&A session started today was for staff to
24 comment on the concerns of Sylmar residents on the path of
25 SR14. And the answer we all heard was that hey, don't

1 worry Sylmar residents. We are going to dig a tunnel that
2 will be twice as deep in the area as we normally dig. And
3 that will take care of your problem, nothing to worry about
4 here. Boy is he wrong.

5 I have a PhD in mechanical engineering from UCLA
6 with expertise in the area of vibration transmission and
7 control. And you couldn't be further from the truth with
8 that statement. Doubling the depth of the tunnel will not
9 bring sufficient attenuation of the noise and vibration of
10 the surface when the high-speed train is traveling at
11 speeds over 200 miles an hour underneath you.

12 Many of the components of vibration will actually
13 amplify on the way to the surface depending on materials
14 and construction of the ground on the path of the vibration
15 transmission. So some of that vibration will be heard,
16 some will be felt, so you could certainly get quite a bit
17 of both. So I would urge your staff that's making
18 recommendations for high-speed rail, on noise and vibration
19 issues, to reconsider a simplistic statement that was made
20 earlier.

21 To summarize, please consider our opposition to
22 the high-speed rail from being inserted right under our
23 homes. I'd like to leave you with this question. Would
24 you, dear Board Members, accept a 200 mile per hour high-
25 speed train from being dug right underneath your feet?

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Spanos.

3 Mr. Laue, followed by Gino Gabmaten (phonetic) I
4 hope is, that's right? Anyway, yes.

5 MR. LAUE: Hi. Thank you. I'm just going speak
6 spontaneously and not a prepared statement. I just got
7 back from China a week ago and saw how they are building
8 their high-speed rail system. It's quite amazing. I'm
9 sure you're aware of it. And I am one of the few minority
10 people that still support high-speed rail. You've heard
11 all the opposition to it. You've heard it in other places
12 as well. I hope that you don't get too discouraged, by
13 especially hearing from the public officials that this
14 route, there's a lot of opposition to it. We need a high-
15 speed rail. We need high-speed rail from Los Angeles all
16 the way across the state.

17 So I know it's a very difficult project to get
18 support for, but I just hope you guys don't give up. I do
19 think that the route, trying to go through Palmdale has
20 never made any sense to me. There are other ways to get
21 from Bakersfield to LA. And I know you looked at some of
22 the alternatives at the beginning, but this one, there's so
23 much opposition to it that you can't have two more
24 different kinds of communities than Agua Dulce and Sun
25 Valley.

1 I live in Sunland and if you do go through Sun
2 Valley you need to do a big -- work with the city to
3 develop real environmental mitigation project for the whole
4 community, because like that one guy said, they're not
5 getting anything out of this. So I really hope that you
6 don't give up on this. I think that L.A. and Southern
7 California is really gotten the short end of the stick in
8 this whole thing. You are going to get to Bakersfield to
9 L.A. by Bakersfield to San Francisco, but we still need it
10 down at this end. And I think it's easy to say well it's
11 too expensive. There's too much opposition and wind up
12 taking buses to Bakersfield. And that's not acceptable
13 either. So thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

15 Gino, is it Gabmaten, do I have that correctly?
16 Hello, sir?

17 (No audible response.)

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Very well, I won't get a
19 chance to be corrected on that. And Vikki Smith, Vikki
20 Smith?

21 (No audible response.)

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. That is the conclusion
23 of the public comment period. I want to thank everybody
24 for their comments.

25 And at this point, let me first ask if our staff

1 has any additional information that it wants to provide
2 before I turn to my colleagues. I'm not saying that the
3 staff has to. I just wondered if the staff has any
4 additional clarifying comments that it wishes to make.

5 MR. HEDGES: No further comments.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Let me turn to my
7 colleagues on the Board. I'll start down at my right with
8 Director Miller.

9 BOARD MEMBER MILLER: First of all, I just want
10 to thank everybody from all the communities for both the
11 northern San Fernando Valley and those south near Burbank
12 for coming today and expressing, I think, you know, a lot
13 of opposition. And it's important for us to hear this and
14 to evaluate it. So don't think that we don't hear you and
15 listen to you.

16 These meetings down south are a lot different
17 than the meetings that we have in the Central Valley and up
18 north. I'm just going to say that. The project is very
19 much supported in other areas, so obviously we have some
20 work to do with your communities. And I just want to say
21 to you and to the Board that what we are asked here to do
22 today is not to make a final decision, but to proceed with
23 looking at alternatives on this particular route.

24 So the reasons why we look at alternatives, and I
25 mean I think you know with E2 we had a lot of opposition,

1 staff went back to the drawing board. It appears to me
2 that they met with a lot of the community to talk about
3 this new alternative, most of which is underground,
4 obviously not all of it. So I am quite frankly -- I want
5 to continue that discussion.

6 I mean I know some people said today why do we
7 even need the rail? You can get to L.A. in an hour or San
8 Francisco in an hour from LA, or from San Francisco to L.A.
9 in an hour, and I mean that's not true. I live in the
10 northern, I live in Sacramento and traveling in this state
11 is only going to get worse if we don't do something.

12 I agree that what we do is controversial. But I
13 believe based on the data that I've looked at, that high-
14 speed rail is an effective way of moving people that is
15 environmentally sound, economically sound and does connect
16 an entire state, which we are huge.

17 So I'm, for my Board Members, my first time in
18 Burbank, I'm a newer member on the Board, that I plan on
19 supporting staff's recommendation. But I do want to hear
20 more about the underground alternatives that people have
21 talked about here today, meeting with communities to try to
22 ascertain if there are ways to solve some of these
23 problems, particularly acquisition, tunneling underground
24 of folks' homes.

25 I don't believe there's vibration issues,

1 personally. I live in a place where I've got something
2 under the ground in my location and there are not any
3 issues that I'm aware of in terms of vibration or anything
4 like that.

5 But I did listen today and I am concerned at the
6 level of opposition, so I would like to try to work on
7 that. And I pledge to the Board that I'm willing -- I
8 want to go visit some of these communities and talk a
9 little bit with the legislative members about what we might
10 be able to do. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

12 Ms. Schenk, Director Schenk?

13 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Thank you. I too have been
14 here before in Southern California and have heard
15 opposition. I don't think there's anyone in the room more
16 frustrated than I, because I live in San Diego. And when
17 this project first started in 1981 it was going to be San
18 Diego to Los Angeles, the then and I still believe second
19 busiest Amtrak corridor in the United States. And in fact
20 we had entered into an MOU with then Mayor Bradley for the
21 state, through Caltrans to acquire Union Station as part of
22 high-speed rail.

23 But things change, circumstances change. And now
24 I am very frustrated that the south, and especially my area
25 of Southern California, is completely out of the loop. For

1 those who say that it takes an hour. Yeah, maybe once
2 you're in the air, but need I remind anybody about getting
3 to the airport two hours early, getting through TSA, fog,
4 delays, downtown to downtown. I have never made it in one
5 hour from either L.A. or San Diego to downtown San
6 Francisco.

7 As one of the gentlemen pointed out something has
8 to be done, either more airports or more freeways or more I
9 don't know what, but even with self-driving cars we're not
10 going to be able to mitigate without adding on to something
11 like high-speed rail.

12 And for those who have traveled around the world,
13 whether it's China or Europe, we are in fact a third world
14 country when it comes to transportation, particularly high-
15 speed rail. And everywhere, everywhere, from Japan to
16 Spain, where there's been high-speed rail and stations
17 there has been economic development. There have been jobs,
18 there have been improved quality of life.

19 Yes, we have enormous challenges, but we are a
20 people of innovation and optimism. And I believe we can
21 get through this. Not everyone is going to be happy. I'm
22 not happy. But just saying no is not an option, so I too
23 will be supportive of the staff's recommendation. We've
24 gone through many years of looking at alternatives, of
25 listening, of going into meetings. And we will continue

1 the work. We will continue to work. We will continue to
2 listen, continue to read everything that you send. Every
3 member of the public should know that my colleagues, we
4 spend hours reading what you send. We spend hours with
5 staff preparation. We spend hours of study. This is not
6 something where we just show up and vote.

7 I am concerned about two issues. One the Valley
8 Fever issue, which has been brought up before, and Mr.
9 Chairman I know you're going to comment on that. And then
10 on the proposed alternative, the mitigation where I see
11 that the SR14 Route, the distance across hazardous fault
12 zones is, of the three alternatives, the lowest rated. And
13 so I want to get more information on mitigation on that
14 particular issue as well as some of the comments that were
15 made here earlier.

16 But just one personal comment, we're all in this
17 together. And all of us talk about elevating civic
18 discourse. But sitting here and listening to our Chairman
19 being called a liar, sitting here listening to these really
20 personal ad homonym attacks does not elevate the civic
21 discourse. And I hope that going forward we can keep it on
22 the facts as they are presented. Thank you very much.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I'm going to jump down to
24 Director Camacho and then come this way. If you have
25 comments you want to make? Don't feel compelled; I just

1 wanted to offer it.

2 BOARD MEMBER CAMACHO: Thank you.

3 I would echo this position of my colleagues, both
4 Nancy Miller and Dr. Schenk. Years ago, I served as the
5 Vice Chairman and Chairman of the Board of the Rail
6 Construction Corporation, which built the light rail lines
7 and the heavy rail lines coming through L.A. County: the
8 Red Line, the Blue Line, the Green Line. And many of the
9 complaints and many of the issues that you raised this
10 morning are analogous to the issues that were raised then.
11 So I am sensitive to your issues.

12 And it's different by we can read what you write,
13 but it's different to hear you articulate it. And
14 certainly it has a certain amount of impact. I, along with
15 my colleagues, I will also look and ask more questions as
16 I'm sure they will. And I won't belabor that other than to
17 say that I am sensitive to your issues. But I, along with
18 my colleagues, believe that there is a price that we're
19 going to pay. And we all will pay it.

20 And I think that if this state is going to be as
21 progressive as we think it is, that we need to have a world
22 class system of mobility and I will support that idea.

23 Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Director Rossi? Press the red
25 button.

1 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Thank you. I'm not going to
2 support the recommendation of the staff unless there is a
3 clear analysis of the effects of the sound. I haven't seen
4 one. It may be my fault, but I haven't seen it. I want to
5 see it. I also want to see a clear analysis of what
6 happens in these areas if we tunnel underground. And I
7 also want to understand clearly the impacts on water.

8 (Applause.)

9 Please don't do that, because I do agree that we
10 need to be civil here to everyone's side, as hard as it is
11 for all of us and how painful it is. Because I don't think
12 in this country we are moving in the right direction by
13 listening to each other. So I appreciate you just -- if
14 you agree, you agree. If you don't, you don't. Just let
15 me finish.

16 The fact is that I think that the work I've seen
17 is indicative of exactly what's being requested that more
18 analysis be done. But I want to be clear that the analysis
19 that I want to see falls in those areas. And I truly want
20 to understand the mitigations and the costs of those
21 mitigations. So Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to support this
22 with those caveats and they would need to be written into -

23 -

24 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: The resolution.

25 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: -- the resolution. Yes,

1 thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Rossi.

3 Vice Chair Richards?

4 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5 I appreciate the comments of all of our
6 colleagues here and I would echo exactly what Mike just
7 said with regards to the things that I'd like to see. I
8 think that the staff has done a lot of work and it's been
9 good work and it's been well presented, well prepared.
10 The challenges are we know that no matter where we go with
11 this project, some people are going to be pleased and other
12 people are not.

13 I have the, I think the pleasure frankly, and the
14 advantage of being from Fresno where this was all started.
15 And so we've gone through the whole process in my own
16 community. We have started with a room just like this. I
17 would suspect and I would suggest to you probably with
18 maybe twice as many people and we have come through the
19 other end of it. Four or five years later, we have
20 satisfied I would say many, I would say most of the people.
21 We've certainly impacted people just as yourselves.

22 The one thing that resonates with me that seems
23 different to me, I think we impacted in Fresno, it seems
24 like more businesses. And while I know that we also
25 impacted people in their homes it wasn't with the same

1 degree of intensity as what we have heard today.

2 I was going to say a number of the same things that
3 Mike just said. I'm interested in ensuring, if I'm going
4 to support moving this forward and I would like that to
5 occur, because the process needs to move, but I want to see
6 what it is that we can either do differently, how it's
7 actually -- I've got questions with regards to some of your
8 comments that were made today that I want to pursue to make
9 sure that I understand the other side of the comment, or
10 the answer. And I'm going to question to the level of
11 making sure I fully understand it before I accept it.

12 I'd like to try to find a way, and I think that
13 all of my colleagues up here would feel the same way, we'd
14 like to find a way to impact you less. But as Director
15 Schenk said people are always going to be impacted. We
16 can't avoid that.

17 What I thought when I walked in here today is I
18 thought after having read through this and been through
19 this, and I've been in each one of your communities, I
20 thought that we really made progress here. And I suspect
21 because of some of the people we have not seen here that we
22 saw before we must have eliminated or relieved to some
23 extent the implication of impacts on them. That's my
24 impression.

25 But I do think that we can perhaps make this, at

1 least from my perspective of I need to be better prepared
2 from the perspective of what I'm understanding, both in
3 what I've read and questions that I now have. But with
4 those caveats I also am prepared to move this forward. But
5 I want you to understand, and there's not a person up here
6 I'm sure would say any different, it's not just with a
7 blind pass. It's with the expectation that a lot of
8 questions are going to be answered and alternatives
9 considered to the extent that we are able to under the
10 constraints that we live with.

11 And I would only suggest one other thing to you.
12 As dark as it may seem today I've lived through this same
13 thing with a lot of people, both and friends and new
14 friends and colleagues, people I didn't know, in working
15 through these things in my community in Fresno. And I
16 would say that if you had the opportunity to talk to any
17 numbers of people up there you would see that some of the
18 reaction that I've heard here today with regards to your
19 sense of who we are and what we're doing and how we're
20 doing it, you would come away with a different perspective
21 from listening to people who've actually worked through
22 this process with us for several years.

23 And I would hope that what you will see here, as
24 we get through this, you'll come away with the same
25 feeling. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. I want to touch on
2 four areas: some historical contexts, remaining issues, a
3 couple of specific areas that people have raised and then
4 also talk about paths forward.

5 But before I do that I want to offer a sincere
6 and heartfelt thanks to members of all these communities
7 who have come out today. I do understand that you're
8 taking time out of your lives, in some cases time off work.
9 Some of you have come from greater distances. Some of the
10 communities most affected are probably farthest from where
11 we sit today. That's certain Acton, Agua Dulce and Sylmar.
12 So we understand that you have come here today to express
13 your concerns and I want to assure you that we have
14 listened.

15 Let's talk for a moment about the historical
16 context. What we're about to do today, if my colleagues
17 agree to move forward with the caveats and provisions that
18 have been laid out I think very appropriately by Director
19 Rossi and others, is to narrow and focus the environmental
20 analysis. It's not to stop it. It's not to end it. In
21 fact, it's to focus it on the remaining important
22 environmental questions.

23 And in so doing, what we're saying to communities
24 that for the last several years have faced uncertainty as
25 four or more different routes have been looked at is to

1 tell them, "Well, we can't say it's 100 percent, this is
2 where we're focusing our attention. And now that we're
3 focusing our attention there we have to be very, very
4 detailed about understanding specific environmental impacts
5 and impacts on those communities."

6 People often talk about what was voted on back in
7 2008. You go back to 2008 and you look at the maps and at
8 that point, people were just taking magic markers and
9 drawing lines on a map. Probably the most anticipated
10 route out of Los Angeles heading north, went up the actual
11 SR14. It went up the San Fernando Boulevard area, San
12 Fernando, sort of the I-5 Corridor, went along the SR14,
13 all of that surface.

14 If you look back at that route some 8,000 homes
15 and businesses would have been affected by that route. If
16 you look then at the alternatives that were put out to that
17 route, and that was first proposed and requested, basically
18 demanded of us to asses by former Supervisor Antonovich, we
19 said well okay we can avoid that. We can come underneath
20 with a long tunnel, tunneling technology having moved
21 forward from the days when this was first contemplated.
22 But that left three major routes through areas that
23 included equestrian communities, not only in Acton, but
24 equestrian communities in the northeast quadrant of the San
25 Fernando Valley, in Shadow Hills, Lake View Terrace,

1 Sunland-Tujunga and so forth.

2 One of those routes, E2, came out from under the
3 mountains and crossed over the great Tujunga Wash over the
4 Foothill Freeway. As I recall it, that route would have
5 taken something like 345 homes, taken 345 homes, I think it
6 was, in those areas.

7 The Preferred Alternate that the staff is
8 suggesting today does not take 8,000 homes, does not take
9 345 homes, does not transect the great Tujunga Wash. The
10 Preferred Alternate that the staff is asking us to look at,
11 as I asked the staff yesterday in terms takings, I'm not
12 insulting the people from Sylmar who are concerned about
13 goes on under their house, but in terms of takings the
14 staff said they're not sure at this point whether the
15 number of residences taken under the Preferred Alternate is
16 zero or one. So that just says that there's been a lot of
17 work done to try to minimize impacts.

18 Now, obviously it's disproportionate. If you
19 live in Acton, that isn't really of great comfort to you
20 and I get that. But it is to say that it's been a serious
21 effort on the part of the High-Speed Rail Authority Staff
22 to look at all these and to try to minimize impacts.

23 What are the remaining issues? One of my
24 responsibilities as Board Chair, and of course all of the
25 Board Members engage in this, but I have spent many days in

1 many parts of this alignment area. As Ms. Walter pointed
2 out I have spent a day in Acton. I'm very familiar with
3 that community. I've spent a day in the Shadow Hills-Kagel
4 Canyon area. I've spent a day in San Fernando. I've not
5 been in Sylmar, but I've spent many days on many parts of
6 this route to try to understand what this means to people
7 on the ground.

8 We are human beings sitting up here. We're not
9 bureaucrats. We care very much about human impacts of this
10 and we all feel that. We know as my colleague Ms. Schenk
11 said, that we can't avoid all impacts, but it's certainly
12 in our hearts and minds to do everything that we can.

13 I am very concerned about the remaining impacts
14 on Acton, from this alignment. So my commitment to you is
15 we're not done yet. I'm not going to overly promise. I
16 want to be very clear about that. That would be
17 irresponsible of me, but I will give you this commitment.
18 We've got more work to do in your community. And we will
19 do it. And so the analysis, as my colleague called for, of
20 looking at things like underground vibration and other
21 effects in Sylmar and looking at noise and related issues
22 in Acton, I believe that that would have in any case been
23 required to be part of the further environmental analysis.
24 But this Board will make sure that that analysis is there.
25 And it will be science-based.

1 I want to talk about two specific issues that are
2 very important to us: health issues and environmental
3 justice issues. Mr. Lunde asked the question about Valley
4 Fever. I would ask our staff to reach out to him to
5 provide information to him and the others in his community
6 about how we have addressed this issue in the Central
7 Valley. This is a major issue in the Central Valley. The
8 Board adopted a program to limit the exposure to Valley
9 Fever with the Central Valley construction. We not only
10 did that, but at one point, the Board directed our internal
11 auditor to audit the effectiveness with which the
12 contractors were adhering to that procedure.

13 We are very familiar with the terrible effects of
14 the fungal borne spores that Valley Fever is based on. And
15 we're very concerned about exposure to the workers and to
16 the communities through the construction. So you can be
17 assured that whatever we do as we reach into these areas in
18 the southland we will bring those same concerns with us,
19 for the protection of your public health.

20 Environmental justice is something that is not
21 only important to us, but I will say as a person of my
22 demographic, I'm quite proud of the record that we have had
23 so far. We have, in the communities that we have been
24 working in, in central California been quite attentive to
25 this issue. At one point, in the town of Wasco where there

1 was a migrant labor facility camp, if you will housing, on
2 the other side of the tracks from the town and where
3 literally mothers were pushing their baby carriages across
4 the railroad tracks. With the cooperation of state housing
5 authorities we literally have lifted that community up,
6 moved it over and built new housing for them in the town of
7 Wasco to put them on the right side of the tracks.

8 Similarly, in very wealthy communities in
9 Northern California, Atherton, Palo Alto, where they have
10 stood up and insisted that they didn't want the train we've
11 said, "We're sorry, but this is the best alignment. This
12 is where the train needs to go." So there are two sides to
13 the environmental justice coin and I think we have had a
14 good record.

15 I am very familiar with the history of people who
16 live in Pacoima. Many of them were displaced from East
17 L.A. when Interstate 10 was extended eastward. And that's
18 why they live in this community. And so if I were a
19 resident of Pacoima or if I were a resident of Sun Valley,
20 I would be suspicious that once again somebody's coming
21 into my community and making it a dumping ground. That is
22 not going to happen.

23 If you look at how we've dealt with Fresno, which
24 has a 25.1 percent poverty rate, it's one of the poorest
25 communities in the state, we were able to 95 percent of the

1 businesses that were relocated there in the city of Fresno
2 with relocation assistance. My friend Tom Richards was
3 right in the heart of this with the economic development
4 community in Fresno. And many of those businesses found
5 that they were able to expand, modernize and hire more
6 people.

7 That is the way we would look at something like
8 Sun Valley or Pacoima where we come up, and we do
9 understand the nature of the businesses that are there.
10 About 175 of them could be affected. We will be making
11 sure that we do everything to protect the economic vitality
12 of those communities as we go forward. So those two issues
13 I wanted to talk about.

14 Now finally, the path forward. As we said since
15 the beginning our vote to narrow the analysis and focus it
16 is not a final determination. It doesn't mean that we have
17 not heard or ignored the issues that have been raised
18 today, far from it. I think now those are things that we
19 know we have to focus on.

20 Your elected officials, whether it's Mayor
21 Garcetti, with whom I've met; Supervisor Barger with whom
22 we've met; Councilmember Martinez; Councilmember Rodriguez;
23 Senator Hertzberg, they are very engaged in this. They
24 certainly are focused on it. We will continue to work with
25 them to address these issues as we go forward.

1 So I apologize for a lengthy statement, but this
2 is a very important issue. You took time out of your day
3 to come here to talk to us. I'm hoping that I'm reflecting
4 back to you the seriousness with which we take your issues
5 and we will continue to do that.

6 So unless there are other comments I'm hoping
7 that you brought some additional language, Counsel? So Mr.
8 Andrew, who is our Associate General Counsel wants to add
9 to the resolution. And so I'm reading this out loud for
10 Mr. Rossi to see if it's satisfactory for him and other
11 Board Members.

12 So under the resolution section right now it
13 says: "Therefore, it is resolved that the Authority Board
14 concurs with the staff recommendation of the Refined SR14
15 Alternate shall be identified as the State's Preferred
16 Alternative in the forthcoming Palmdale to Burbank Draft
17 EIR/EIS."

18 He then adds this language, "Provided that
19 detailed studies of the following impacts and potential
20 mitigations and their costs are included in the public
21 Draft EIR/EIS and made available to the Board: 1) Noise
22 impacts in rural communities. 2) Water impacts from
23 tunneling. And 3) Tunneling under homes."

24 Mr. Rossi, is that language satisfactory to you?

25 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Yes, it is.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Other members of the Board?

2 BOARD MEMBER MILLER: No.

3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Ms. Miller?

4 BOARD MEMBER MILLER: I don't -- not just
5 tunneling under homes. I think the idea was potentially
6 undergrounding of additional segments.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Why don't we just say well,
8 impacts?

9 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Just put tunnels.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Just put tunneling.

11 BOARD MEMBER MILLER: Yeah. That will be fine.

12 Thanks.

13 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Just put tunneling. Okay.

14 Ms. Schenk?

15 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Well, does that include my
16 concern about the fault zones?

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I think if we say tunneling,
18 that that would include the fault zones. Okay, other
19 members?

20 (No audible response.)

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right. If that's
22 satisfactory then I'm going to ask for a motion.

23 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: So moved.

24 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Second.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Moved by Director Rossi,

1 seconded by Vice Chair Richards. So this is on Resolution
2 18-19 and we're going to take separate votes on each of the
3 segments.

4 So will the Secretary please call the roll?

5 MR. DROZD: Director Schenk?

6 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Yes.

7 MR. DROZD: Vice Chair Richards?

8 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes.

9 MR. DROZD: Director Rossi?

10 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Yes.

11 MR. DROZD: Director Camacho?

12 BOARD MEMBER CAMACHO: Yes.

13 MR. DROZD: Director Miller?

14 BOARD MEMBER MILLER: Yes.

15 MR. DROZD: Chair Richard?

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes.

17 Okay. The next resolution relates to the Staff
18 Preferred Alternative for the Burbank to Los Angeles
19 section.

20 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: So moved.

21 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Second.

22 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Moved by Director Rossi,
24 seconded by Directors Richards and Schenk. Will the
25 Secretary please call the roll?

1 MR. DROZD: Director Schenk?

2 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Yes.

3 MR. DROZD: Vice Chair Richards?

4 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes.

5 MR. DROZD: Director Rossi?

6 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Yes.

7 MR. DROZD: Director Camacho?

8 BOARD MEMBER CAMACHO: Yes.

9 MR. DROZD: Director Miller?

10 BOARD MEMBER MILLER: Yes.

11 MR. DROZD: Chair Richard?

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes.

13 And finally the staff's proposed Preferred
14 Alternative for the route from Los Angeles to Anaheim.

15 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Since it's the closest to
16 San Diego, I will move it. (Laughter.)

17 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: I'll second.

18 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: I got left out.

19 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: You can walk from Anaheim.

20 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Right, but there is good
21 Amtrak service. (Laughter.) Okay. So it has been moved by
22 Director Schenk, seconded, I believe, by Director Rossi.

23 Will the Secretary please call the roll?

24 MR. DROZD: Director Schenk?

25 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Yes.

1 MR. DROZD: Vice Chair Richards?

2 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes.

3 MR. DROZD: Director Rossi?

4 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Yes.

5 MR. DROZD: Director Camacho?

6 BOARD MEMBER CAMACHO: Yes.

7 MR. DROZD: Director Miller?

8 BOARD MEMBER MILLER: Yes.

9 MR. DROZD: Chair Richard?

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes.

11 With that we conclude those issues. We just have
12 one other issue, a motion by the Board to adopt the minutes
13 from the last Board Meeting.

14 BOARD MEMBER MILLER: So moved.

15 BOARD MEMBER CAMACHO: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Moved by Director Miller,
17 seconded by?

18 BOARD MEMBER CAMACHO: Me.

19 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Vice Chair Richards.

20 Secretary, please call the -- oh, it was Director
21 Camacho who's seconded it.

22 Will the Secretary please call the roll?

23 MR. DROZD: Director Schenk?

24 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Yes.

25 MR. DROZD: Vice Chair Richards?

1 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes.

2 MR. DROZD: Director Rossi?

3 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Yes.

4 MR. DROZD: Director Camacho?

5 BOARD MEMBER CAMACHO: Yes.

6 MR. DROZD: Director Miller?

7 BOARD MEMBER MILLER: Yes.

8 MR. DROZD: Chair Richard?

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes.

10 With that the public portion of the meeting has
11 concluded. The Board will enter into a closed -- I think a
12 brief closed session. Mr. Secretary, where is that?

13 MR. DROZD: It's the same room as
14 (indiscernible).

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay, in one of the anti-rooms
16 here. We'll report back after that. Once again, thank you
17 to all members of the public. I appreciate it.

18 (Off the record at 1:44 p.m.)

19 (On the record at 2:40 a.m.)

20 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay, back in session. The
21 closed session of the High-Speed Rail Authority Board has
22 completed. There are no items to report. With that, this
23 meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

24 (Chairman Dan Richards adjourned the Board Meeting
25 at 2:40 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 6th day of December, 2018.



MARTHA L. NELSON, CERT**367

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 6th day of December, 2018.



Myra Severtson
Certified Transcriber
AAERT No. CET**D-852