

1 CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY  
2 MONTHLY MEETING

3  
4  
5 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

6  
7  
8  
9 Metro Board Room  
10 One Gateway Plaza, 3rd Floor  
11 Los Angeles, California 90012

12  
13  
14 Monday, October 14, 2013  
15 10:15 a.m.

16  
17 BARBARA SMALL  
18 CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER  
19 LICENSE NO. 13345  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

APPEARANCES

BOARD MEMBERS:

- Mr. Dan Richard, Chairman
- Mr. Jim Hartnett, Vice-Chair
- Mr. Tom Richards, Vice-Chair
- Mr. Richard Frank
- Mr. Patrick Henning
- Ms. Katherine Perez-Estolano
- Mr. Michael Rossi
- Ms. Lynn Schenk
- Mr. Thomas Umberg

STAFF

- Ms. Angie Reed, Interim Board Secretary
- Ms. Janice Niebel, Board Secretary

ALSO PRESENT:

- Mr. Jeff Morales, CEO
- Thomas Fellenz, Esq., Legal Counsel

INDEX

<u>Meeting Agenda:</u>	<u>Page</u>
Public comment	8
Item 1. Approval of Board Minutes from September 10, 2013 meeting	74
Item 2. Status Report on Southern California Project Sections	
Item 3. Report from the San Diego Association of Governments on TIGER Grant Award	77
Item 4. Aware of Regional Consultant Contracts for the Merced to Sacramento and Los Angeles to San Diego Project Sections	89
Item 5. Adoption of a Policy for Unsolicited Proposals	95
Adjournment	104

1 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, MONDAY,  
2 OCTOBER 14, 2013, 10:15 A.M.

3 000  
4

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good morning, everybody.  
6 I'd ask people to take their seats.

7 All right. Good morning. We did call the  
8 roll earlier when we opened the meeting just prior to  
9 the closed session that the High-Speed Rail Authority  
10 had. We emerged from that session with no actions to  
11 report.

12 So with the roll called, I will return this  
13 meeting of the California High-Speed Rail Authority to  
14 order. And I'd like to start with asking us, ask  
15 Mr. Umberg to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

16 MR. UMBERG: All rise.

17 (Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: So good morning, everyone.  
19 And the first item will be public comment.

20 And to begin, I would like to say that on  
21 behalf of the Authority we are very appreciative that  
22 our colleagues and partners at the Los Angeles  
23 Metropolitan Transportation Authority have once again  
24 made this room available to us, and that I understand  
25 that Metro's Paul Taylor wanted to welcome us. And

1 we're very gratified by that.

2 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

3 welcome to Los Angeles and to the Metro  
4 headquarters and the Union Station complex. On behalf  
5 of the Board and Art Leahy, our Chief Executive  
6 Officer, I'd like to extend warmest greetings and  
7 appreciation for the partnership that we have had with  
8 High-Speed Rail Authority on things like the blended  
9 approach and on the Initial Operating Segment, and most  
10 particular to where we are today on master planning for  
11 Union Station.

12 The Union Station, which is in its 75th year,  
13 and will be celebrating an anniversary next spring, is  
14 the hub for rail in Southern California, probably the  
15 hub for transit in general. And from here you can get  
16 anywhere. And over the 75 years of its existence,  
17 Union Station is getting better and better, most  
18 particularly in the last two years under the ownership  
19 of L.A. Metro.

20 So, if you have a minute to take a look at  
21 the station when you're done, I commend that to you and  
22 I welcome you and look forward to continuing our  
23 harmonious relationship. Thanks.

24 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Taylor. We  
25 appreciate that very much. And please give our

1 appreciation and thanks to Mr. Leahy and to the members  
2 of your Board.

3 And I second what Paul Taylor just said.  
4 What L.A. Metro has done with the restoration and  
5 revitalization of Union Station is just remarkable.  
6 It's beautiful and it's exciting, and it's going to be  
7 even more so as the years go on. So thank you.

8 Before I turn to the comment cards from the  
9 people in the room, we did have a remote site this  
10 morning because one of our members, Richard Frank, had  
11 a teaching obligation in U.C. Davis, and so to comply  
12 with the open meeting law, there was a site that was  
13 created there. And I'll ask our representative on that  
14 site, Miss Parker, are there any members of the public  
15 at the site in Davis, California who wish to speak this  
16 morning?

17 MS. PARKER: Good morning, everyone. This is  
18 Annie Parker, information officer of the High-Speed  
19 Rail Authority.

20 There is no one here to give public comment  
21 this morning.

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right. Thank you very  
23 much, Miss Parker.

24 We will now move to our public comment period  
25 here. As is our practice, we offer our elected

1 officials the opportunity to speak first. The one  
2 representative from the area of Santa Clarita has asked  
3 to speak with members of her community, so we'll save  
4 that until then. But let's start just down the road.

5 We'd like to welcome Mayor Pro Tem Gail  
6 Eastman from the City of Anaheim.

7 MS. EASTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and  
8 board members for this opportunity to stress how  
9 important it is that you remain committed to the  
10 single-seat ride from San Francisco to Anaheim.

11 I'm proud to represent Anaheim, and as a  
12 member of the OCTA Board of Directors, I will represent  
13 them also.

14 Anaheim is home to 350,000 people, but more  
15 importantly, it's the center of Orange County. It is  
16 home to 3 million people. Orange County employs 1.5  
17 million people, with Anaheim having the largest single  
18 site employer in the state. Orange County welcomes 40  
19 million visitors a year, and 20 million of them are  
20 headed to Anaheim.

21 Projections show significant growth in all of  
22 these categories in the next 20 years. Orange County  
23 is not a suburb of L.A. and requires a full high-speed  
24 rail connection with a single-seat ride. The 66,000  
25 square foot Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal

1 Station, we call it ARTIC for short, will open next  
2 year, on time, ahead of budget, or within budget, and  
3 that will provide the regional center for Orange  
4 County, much like where we're at in L.A. today. ARTIC  
5 will initially serve 10 transportation modes and is  
6 designed to accommodate full transportation modes,  
7 future transportation modes like our planned street car  
8 in Anaheim, the Cal-Nev Super-Speed train, and of  
9 course California High-Speed Rail.

10 ARTIC is not only immediately adjacent to  
11 Angel Stadium and the Honda Center, but Anaheim has  
12 rezoned 820 acres adjacent to ARTIC to recreate  
13 transit-oriented development, offering high density,  
14 mixed-use development for over 18,000 homes or  
15 residences and 14 million square feet of commercial and  
16 office space.

17 It looks like I'm out of time.

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: That's all right, just go  
19 ahead.

20 MS. EASTMAN: I just have a couple more  
21 points here I'd like to cover.

22 The Anaheim Resort and Convention Center is  
23 just three miles down the road. And the Disney Company  
24 and the City of Anaheim, along with other business, are  
25 expanding so that we can accommodate more people. By

1 2035 there will be 75,000 jobs, 41,000 residents and 31  
2 million visitors within a few minutes of ARTIC.

3 Transportation investments serving ARTIC are  
4 good for the region and good for the state. Orange  
5 County tourism represents 140,000 people and the Orange  
6 County visitor spends -- visitors spend 8.7 billion  
7 annually in our community.

8 Anaheim supports High-Speed Rail and  
9 demonstrated that support by executing the MOU with  
10 High-Speed Rail outlining the agency's goals and  
11 committed to our cooperation. Anaheim wants High-Speed  
12 Rail to remain committed to their promises to Anaheim  
13 and the voters to make Anaheim the true southern  
14 terminus and assure ARTIC is served with a single-seat  
15 ride from San Francisco to Anaheim.

16 Thank you very much.

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mayor.

18 If I might, I would also just acknowledge  
19 your colleague on the City Council, Chris Murray, who  
20 is here, who has been a great friend. And I can assure  
21 you and the citizens of Anaheim that since we adopted  
22 the single-seat ride as our policy in the last revised  
23 business plan, that there have been no changes to that.  
24 But we appreciate your coming here today to confirm  
25 that.

1           Next is Mayor of the City of Palmdale. Mayor  
2 Jim Ledford.

3           Mayor Ledford, I was looking for you  
4 beforehand and wanted to shake your hand and say hello.

5           MAYOR LEDFORD: Good morning.

6           CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good morning.

7           MAYOR LEDFORD: Good morning, Honorable Chair  
8 and board members.

9           We're just excited to be a part of the  
10 process. And I'm here to tell you that our Antelope  
11 valley is enthused and is engaged in this entire  
12 alignment and the possibilities of being a hub, an  
13 interstate hub in the City of Palmdale. We think it's  
14 so exciting for our community.

15           And I'm here just to say thank you,  
16 congratulations on this innovation that we see coming  
17 out of this Authority. You guys have really looked at  
18 all the options, and we're thankful for that. It's an  
19 exciting project to be a part of. We're committed  
20 because we know how important it is to our region for  
21 the Antelope valley access to an interstate high-speed  
22 rail, a single-seat ride from Los Angeles to San  
23 Francisco. These are all things that we endorse.

24           We are also excited about the Authority's,  
25 your approach to our station location. Of course we

1 have a preferred station location in our community, but  
2 we appreciate the process that allows a thorough  
3 evaluation of all options, and to come up with the best  
4 fit for our Antelope valley we think is, again, the  
5 goal. We understand that.

6 We also know that we're getting some grant  
7 funding now. We're looking at some transitory  
8 development grant funding. We're looking at some TOD3  
9 grants from Metro. We're looking at some station  
10 planning grant monies. These are all very important,  
11 we think, to establish this vision to put it on,  
12 obviously on paper and implement and get it built is  
13 truly in the best interests, we think, of the entire  
14 State of California.

15 So again, we're very, very bullish on that.  
16 We like the idea of, again, being in that hub, that  
17 interstate hub. We think that is very exciting and we  
18 think it's going to prove to be the correct economic  
19 decision and the ridership decision. And we just think  
20 there's so much going with this project, we're so  
21 excited to be part of it. And we, again, we want to  
22 compliment your staff for being very engaged and open  
23 as far as allowing us to look at alternatives.

24 Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mayor.

1 I think that concludes our elected officials.  
2 I do want to acknowledge in our crowd is -- I want to  
3 acknowledge Gary Gallegos who's the head of San Diego  
4 Association of Governments and has been a tremendous  
5 transportation leader in the State of California.

6 Okay. So with that -- oh, I'm sorry. Before  
7 we do that, we have one other item. Thank you,  
8 Mr. Morales, for bringing that to my attention.  
9 Although he's not here in person today, Los Angeles  
10 County Supervisor Michael Antonovich had a  
11 communication with the High-Speed Rail Authority, and  
12 he requested that his letter be read into the record.  
13 So I'm going to ask Michelle Boehm of our staff to read  
14 Mr. -- Supervisor Antonovich's letter into the record.

15 MS. BOEHM: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Board.  
16 from Supervisor Antonovich. (Reading):

17 "As Supervisor for Los Angeles County's  
18 5th District and immediate past Chairman of  
19 the Los Angeles County Metropolitan  
20 Transportation Authority, I take great  
21 interest in the California High-Speed Rail's  
22 potential to link Southern California to  
23 northern California, to create a statewide  
24 integrated passenger rail network and to  
25 develop Palmdale and the Antelope Valley as a

1 high speed rail hub with a future connection  
2 to Las Vegas via the High Desert Corridor and  
3 XpressWest system.

4 During the course of our conversations  
5 regarding the project, we have discussed the  
6 complexities involved in completing the  
7 high-speed rail system, such as crossing the  
8 Tehachapi Mountains to the north of Los  
9 Angeles County and running through Acton,  
10 Agua Dulce, and the Santa Clarita valley  
11 within Los Angeles County, in order to reach  
12 the San Fernando Valley and points further  
13 south and east as you complete the system in  
14 the years to come.

15 I encourage the Authority to review a  
16 tunnel-oriented alternative between the  
17 Palmdale station and the potential San  
18 Fernando Valley station that would provide a  
19 more direct, much faster, less costly and  
20 less community-intrusive route between the  
21 Antelope Valley and the San Fernando Valley.  
22 Such an approach could provide a boon to the  
23 Authority by eliminating conflict with the  
24 Acton, Agua Dulce and Sand Canyon communities  
25 in my district while also helping the project

1 reduce its costs and travel times in reaching  
2 the Los Angeles basin.

3 Additionally, this concept would also  
4 drive greater incentives to secure outside  
5 funding for the statewide system through a  
6 potential public-private partnership fostered  
7 by the efforts of XpressWest and L.A. Metro  
8 to develop a high speed rail system from Los  
9 Angeles Union Station to Las Vegas via  
10 Palmdale and Victorville that would be  
11 interoperable with California High-Speed Rail  
12 between Los Angeles and Palmdale.

13 Preliminary P3 studies indicate that a  
14 one-seat high-speed rail corridor between Los  
15 Angeles and Las Vegas through Palmdale could  
16 generate billions in revenue that could help  
17 the Authority finance the segment between  
18 Palmdale and Los Angeles.

19 Finally, in light of the potential  
20 financial, capital and operational synergy  
21 with a Los Angeles to Las Vegas high speed  
22 train, I encourage your board to examine  
23 potentially designating Palmdale as a station  
24 in the Initial Operating Segment when you  
25 update your ridership models when preparing

1 for the 2014 business plan. Understanding  
2 the mandate to operate without subsidy, it is  
3 my hope that the updated business plan could  
4 provide the ridership necessary to initiate  
5 service upon reaching Palmdale with upgraded  
6 Metrolink providing an interim connection  
7 between the system and the rest of Southern  
8 California.

9 Thank you again for your leadership in  
10 working with the many communities in my  
11 district, particularly the Santa Clarita  
12 Valley, Acton, Agua Dulce and Antelope Valley  
13 communities, to hear their concerns and find  
14 solutions to whatever issues emerge as you  
15 develop the High-Speed Rail system.  
16 Development of this new alignment between  
17 Palmdale and Burbank can provide a win-win  
18 solution for both the Authority and the many  
19 communities I represent.

20 Sincerely, Mike Antonovich."

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Miss Boehm.  
22 We will be responding to the Supervisor. We appreciate  
23 his input and his support.

24 Turning now to other members of the public,  
25 we'll hear first from David Schwegel, followed by Linda

1 Culp and Mark Powell.

2 MR. SCHWEGEL: Good morning, fellow leaders.  
3 David Schwegel.

4 I was so inspired by looking at the U.S.  
5 High-Speed Rail vision map that I made a 412-mile drive  
6 down here to express my appreciation for how our Green  
7 Line is the catalyst that connects the world's largest  
8 untapped high-speed rail market to the world's largest  
9 infrastructure project.

10 Speaking of green lines, we have a green line  
11 in the Pacific Northwest which was my home for 11  
12 years. I'm well aware of the severe traffic congestion  
13 issues in Seattle, and I'm pleased to see that Seattle  
14 is hosting the rail conference. I encourage us to  
15 weigh helpfully in on the discussions about how high  
16 speed rail is the catalyst for the rail renaissance  
17 that Seattle is experiencing.

18 Back when I was ASCE Sacramento section  
19 president, ASCE deputy executive director Leonard Roth  
20 taught me that gender, racial and socioeconomic diverse  
21 teams bring broader perspectives, making teams stronger  
22 and stronger. I've seen the success of the recent WTS  
23 policy conference where high speed rail was a central  
24 theme to reach out to the society of women engineers.

25 Finally, when I think back of last

1 December's High-Speed Rail Conference here in this  
2 room, I was especially moved by the deciding vote  
3 caster, Senator Leland Yee, and how he spoke about the  
4 value of providing for future generations being the key  
5 value that tipped the scales in favor of high-speed  
6 rail. And I am looking forward to the convening of  
7 highly intelligent visionary mind and stakeholders here  
8 in this room between November 5 and 7 for the next U.S.  
9 High-Speed Rail Association Conference.

10 Thank you, and we'll see you here in  
11 November.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Schweigel.  
13 Linda Culp, followed by Mark Powell, followed  
14 by Douglas Carstens.

15 MS. CULP: Good morning. Linda Culp,  
16 principal planner with the San Diego Association of  
17 Governments.

18 Chairman Richard, Members of the Board, thank  
19 you for the opportunity to speak this morning, and also  
20 holding your meeting in Los Angeles. We appreciate  
21 that.

22 We in San Diego see the importance of both  
23 improvements to our conventional rail system along the  
24 coast as well as high speed services in our inland  
25 corridor. We have an established market between L.A.

1 and San Diego, in fact, the second busiest for Amtrak  
2 right now, which will provide important feeder services  
3 to high-speed trains either in Anaheim or here at Union  
4 Station.

5 We took an important step last year with an  
6 MOU between eight agencies including both of our  
7 agencies to work together on these improvements.

8 We also see a high-speed service along our  
9 Inland Empire corridor important, not only to connect  
10 us to L.A. and northern California, but also to open up  
11 connections between San Diego and Riverside, San  
12 Bernardino Counties.

13 The inland corridor is home to 18 million  
14 people right now, set to increase to 26 million by the  
15 year 2050, so you see the potential market there. For  
16 the past five years, staffs from our regional agencies  
17 and the CalTrans district along that corridor have  
18 worked with your staff on outreach, environmental  
19 issues, preliminary engineering. And this group we  
20 refer to as the Southern California Inland Corridor  
21 Group, or ICG. We've been engaged in that process. We  
22 appreciate the time that your staff has spent devoting  
23 space to regional agencies.

24 We look forward to working with your new  
25 consulting team so that there's no disruption in the

1 timing of our work. We understand that you are engaged  
2 in the IOS, but we do urge you to continue working on  
3 the full 800-mile network. And we appreciate your  
4 attention to making improvements to both the inland and  
5 corridor rail.

6 Thank you very much.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Miss Culp. And  
8 let me assure you that there's at least one member of  
9 this body who sits two seats to my right who has never  
10 stopped working on the full 800-mile system, and to  
11 this day I think would wish that we had started L.A. to  
12 San Diego first, but she remains a very staunch  
13 advocate for extending this system as it's intended to  
14 be, all the way to San Diego. So.

15 Mark Powell, followed by Douglas Carstens.

16 Good morning, sir.

17 MR. POWELL: Good morning. My name is Mark  
18 Powell.

19 The train's ridership study projects 37  
20 million riders annually. Gas prices are at  
21 historically high levels. The train will require no  
22 operating subsidy. California's freeways are clogged.  
23 And it will create thousands of good-paying jobs during  
24 the worst recession since the Great Depression.

25 For these reasons, Jerry Brown signed

1 California's first High-Speed Rail Bond Act on  
2 September 29, 1982. The proposal was to build 130  
3 miles of dedicated high speed track linking L.A., San  
4 Diego and LAX financed with the combination of private  
5 equity and tax-exempt revenue bonds. However, experts  
6 soon questioned ridership numbers. The project was  
7 termed a boondoggle by respective members of the  
8 academic community. Taxpayers became concerned the  
9 project would fail leaving the state to operate an  
10 unprofitable rail. Communities in the train's path  
11 organized against it and sought relief in the courts.  
12 Construction costs escalated. The schedule slipped and  
13 private financing failed to materialize.

14 In November, 1984 the project's backers  
15 suspended it indefinitely.

16 Much of the bill's wording was penned by  
17 Mehdi Moreshed, a transportation consultant who later  
18 served the current Rail Authority as its Executive  
19 Director, was backed by, among others, Governor Brown  
20 and his Secretary of Business, Transportation and  
21 Housing Lynn Schenk, who would go on to serve on the  
22 current board since 2003, tirelessly advocating  
23 high-speed rail from San Diego to Las Vegas.

24 Jerry Brown spent a lot of time in politics,  
25 winning campaigns always financed with the money of big

1 labor. People ask today why the Governor can still  
2 continue to press forward today with a similar project  
3 that is lacking the 30 billion dollars it needs to  
4 finish its first usable segment and is becoming  
5 increasingly unpopular. The answer, even when they say  
6 it's not, it's always about money. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

8 Next is Douglas Carstens, followed by John  
9 Barna.

10 Counselor, good morning.

11 MR. CARSTENS: Good morning, Chairman  
12 Richard, Honorable Board Members, and Board Member  
13 Frank up there in Davis. Very glad that you are here  
14 and considering these views this morning.

15 I am Douglas Carstens, attorney with the law  
16 firm of Chatten, Brown & Carstens. I'd like to welcome  
17 you to Los Angeles and I wish you a pleasant Columbus  
18 Day and Native American Day.

19 We are representing the California Citizens  
20 for High-Speed Rail Accountability, the County of Kings  
21 and the Kings County Farm Bureau. Separately and  
22 personally we also represent as Friends of The Court in  
23 the town of Atherton proceedings of the former Attorney  
24 General John Van de Camp and 14 environmental groups.

25 We sent you and three federal agencies a

1 letter on October 3 about your consideration of the  
2 Fresno-Bakersfield alignment and about the entire high  
3 speed train system. I provided copies of that letter  
4 to your staff earlier. And if you don't have that, I'd  
5 be glad to provide it again.

6 In the letter we requested that before you  
7 make a choice of any particular alignment or even take  
8 any further substantial action to create further  
9 momentum for the project, you supplement your  
10 programmatic EIR/EIS revised and recirculated for  
11 Fresno-Bakersfield EIR/EIS. The reason you must do  
12 this is that there is now available new information  
13 about significant changes in the Fresno-Bakersfield  
14 project and newly available information about new  
15 technical and seismic impacts in the Fresno-Bakersfield  
16 area that was either not available or not disclosed at  
17 the time of the programmatic EIR/EIS.

18 Also, the programmatic EIR/EIS did not  
19 adequately analyze potential alternative alignments in  
20 the Interstate 5 corridor or the SR-99 corridor.

21 We are asking you to take this opportunity to  
22 set the analysis and the project on a firm footing. We  
23 also ask that you coordinate your effort with the  
24 County of Kings.

25 We would be pleased to answer any questions

1 you may have as you further consider this momentous,  
2 once-in-a-century undertaking, and we hope that it  
3 actually delivers the environmental benefits promised  
4 to the voters approving Proposition 98, minimizing  
5 financial and environmental costs. The project can be  
6 done, but it hopefully must be done right.

7 Appreciate your time this morning.

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, counselor. We,  
9 I just saw your letter. Obviously we will have our  
10 counsel review it, and things will proceed fast.

11 MR. CARSTENS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

13 MR. BARNA: Good morning, Chairman Richard  
14 and Board Members. I am John Barna with AECOM and I am  
15 here to speak on behalf of the unsolicited proposal  
16 items. I believe that's 5, 6 and 7 today.

17 On behalf of AECOM, and specifically and more  
18 broadly some of our industry partners, I want to  
19 applaud the Authority for reaching out with industry as  
20 well as taking a look at what some other states have  
21 been doing with unsolicited proposals. This is a step  
22 in the right direction, in our view, in working with  
23 the private sector. And we welcome the opportunity to  
24 work with staff on the development of the criteria  
25 which we think is very important that we in industry

1 understand that criteria and we appreciate Jeff's, your  
2 CEO Jeff Morales and his staff's willingness to engage  
3 us in an open and transparent manner.

4 Some observations on the proposal. First of  
5 all, it would be helpful to those of us in industry to  
6 get a sense of what the Authority thinks about the  
7 powers that are in the Public Utilities Code cited; for  
8 example, what's the Authority's view on concessions,  
9 what's the Authority's view on franchising, what's the  
10 Authority's view on design, build, finance, operate,  
11 maintain. Those methods will help industry to evaluate  
12 how unsolicited proposals can move forward.

13 I would also encourage that notwithstanding  
14 that there's some discretion provided to staff on this,  
15 that unsolicited proposal procurements do come back to  
16 the board for board action. That will help industry  
17 have that sense of confidence in the Authority and its  
18 actions, and we look forward to working with you.

19 Thank you

20 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: John, before you leave,  
21 just want to say, we appreciate those comments. This  
22 unsolicited proposal approach that Mr. Morales and our  
23 staff sprung forward I think is very important,  
24 particularly in light of what we heard from some of our  
25 elected officials this morning about opportunities here

1 in the Southland and so forth.

2 On the comments you just made, is that  
3 something that you can commit to a memo or something so  
4 that we can see that?

5 MR. BARNA: Absolutely. I'll prepare a  
6 letter and send it to Jeff and the board.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I'd appreciate that,  
8 because you're always thoughtful on these things, and I  
9 think this is a policy the board wants to really dig  
10 into quite a bit.

11 MR. BARNA: Appreciate it. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

13 Our next speaker is -- I'm sorry, is it  
14 Katherine Trinity or Kathleen? Kathleen Trinity, I  
15 believe. Miss Trinity.

16 MS. TRINITY: Kathleen.

17 Good morning, Chairman Richard and Board. I  
18 am a member of the Upton Town Council. I ask that you  
19 reconsider your roots through Acton. I know that when  
20 you look at Acton, you see an area to be exploited by  
21 high-speed rail. You see ranches, homes and businesses  
22 and habitat that you can rip out and force through for  
23 a relatively few people who would use the trains for  
24 the Central Valley, Palmdale and Canyon Country en  
25 route to L.A.

1           when I look at Acton I see a healthy  
2 community; businesses run by locals, some ranches and  
3 homes nestled in many canyons and valleys, as a matter  
4 of fact, many small ranches and homes, homesteads with  
5 horses and trails, mountains and hills covered with  
6 chaparral and juniper, providing a rich habitat for our  
7 wild bobcats, field deer, mountain lions, coyotes,  
8 numerous small mammals, reptiles, bird species.  
9 There's nothing like seeing a red tail hawk flying up  
10 above on the updrafts and down over the valley. It too  
11 wants this land, needs this land.

12           We are a rural equestrian community that has  
13 learned to live in harmony with nature. As a  
14 relatively small community, we cannot absorb the  
15 high-speed rail infrastructure. High-speed rail will  
16 destroy Acton as we know it. No matter how much you  
17 mitigate, you will only increase the blight of huge  
18 intrusive viaducts and tunnels blasted through our  
19 mountains and with more walls, cement and fences.

20           High-speed rail means less feet, fewer  
21 trails, fewer homes and wildlife. The route through  
22 our schools is not right. The route through one of our  
23 largest equestrian canyons, Red River Line, is not  
24 right. Because we live in an area full of canyons and  
25 valleys, no route in Acton is right.

1 Thank you very much.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. Councilmember,  
3 I'm sorry, but we should have had you up earlier in the  
4 agenda, but, apologies.

5 Before we go to our next speaker, could I ask  
6 our Secretary to just open the roll, because we've been  
7 joined by Mr. Rossi.

8 So just call the absentees, as they say in  
9 the legislature. Just call out his name and he'll say  
10 "Here."

11 MS. NIEBEL: Mr. Rossi.

12 MR. ROSSI: Here.

13 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Great.

14 Next speaker is Jose Solorza, followed by  
15 Shelli Andranigian.

16 MR. SOLORZA: Good morning, Honorable Members  
17 of the Board. My name is Jose Solorza. I'm the sales  
18 manager of INECO, a Spanish company in North America  
19 and Central America. Before I talk about my company, I  
20 would like to remark that the Spanish experience in  
21 high-speed rail which currently include more than a  
22 thousand miles of high-speed railway that is ongoing,  
23 construction of 500 miles more, includes the  
24 combination of different technologies existing, which  
25 it's a, well, it's a remarkable and it make a

1 difference between the Spanish experience with the  
2 other countries where the high-speed railways already  
3 are.

4 My company, which is working in high-speed  
5 rail from the beginning, has been working from the  
6 planning, to passing through the signed supervision and  
7 operation and maintenance, both in city roads and  
8 systems. And for this reason we deeply recommend to  
9 facilitate the participation of our kind of company,  
10 not just INECO in particular, in the coming for the  
11 Union Station of incoming future of the high-speed  
12 rail.

13 Particularly I would like to recommend that  
14 in the infrastructure stage, you will find that design  
15 will include in the future preparation for use of  
16 ballast truck or cement truck which is necessary to  
17 facilitate the high-speed railway experience in the  
18 infrastructure the same. I mean infrastructure is the  
19 easy part, but it should be considered the separate  
20 conditions to the design conditions. I know that maybe  
21 some infrastructure is not the most important, but for  
22 the coming system, the stage, we deeply recommend to  
23 facilitate our kind of companies to work in the coming  
24 days. Thank you very much.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Solorza.

1 Shelli Andranigian, followed by Marvin Dean.  
2 MS. ANDRANIGIAN: Good morning, Chairman  
3 Richard, CEO Morales, Members of the Board and  
4 audience. Good morning. My name is Shellie  
5 Andranigian. I'm also a member of the Citizens for  
6 California High-Speed Rail Accountability.

7 Since we're near the entertainment capital of  
8 the world, Hollywood, I'm here to talk today about the  
9 big event at hand: The 21st Century medicine show also  
10 known as California's High-Speed Rail project. This  
11 show isn't just about the land. It's foremost about  
12 the money. It is also about the intent, in this case  
13 the lack of it, by the California High-Speed Rail  
14 Authority to actually build and complete and offer a  
15 high-speed rail system. From where I'm seated the  
16 project is nothing more than an extended shell game  
17 that's approaching a billion dollars with very little  
18 to show thus far. There is not enough money in hand to  
19 guaranty the completed construction and operation of  
20 California high-speed rail; yet, there is just enough  
21 money to guaranty the destruction of homes, businesses  
22 and lives along the proposed routes in the Central  
23 valley.

24 I find it odd that we are here at a public  
25 board meeting to be updated on what is happening with

1 the project, and in particular the Merced, Fresno,  
2 Bakersfield section, which is the backbone of the  
3 project and the first that must meet tight federal  
4 deadlines, yet there is nothing related to the Initial  
5 Operating Segment on the agenda. Is there really  
6 nothing to discuss about the initial construction  
7 segment or the status of the remainder of the aisle  
8 south of Fresno? Don't you want to know the status of  
9 the Fresno-Bakersfield environmental impact report? I  
10 know we sure do. This is staff that briefed you. You  
11 had no problems occurred in the last month. I believe  
12 you are paying these consultants; yet, there are no  
13 updates. If you feel are you are well informed, what  
14 about what is going on and how is the information  
15 getting to you and not also to us?

16 The point of these public board meetings is  
17 so that the public has access to the same information  
18 as the Board. It is the reason why there are open  
19 meeting laws. We would request that you keep to the  
20 letter and spirit of these open meeting laws and have  
21 these discussions on the progress of the IPS, IOS and  
22 active EIRs in full public view.

23 Your finances are also being hidden from  
24 public view. We the people of California deserve an  
25 accounting for how you have spent our state and federal

1 tax dollars, especially with no land aquired, no tracks  
2 laid. I need to see the proof of funding for this rail  
3 system. what happens when you run out of the funds?  
4 will everyone affiliated with the project be moving on  
5 to the next lucrative consulting contract for another  
6 big one, leaving those of us in the proposed path of  
7 the high-speed train in disarray and destruction.

8 The California High-Speed Rail project is  
9 nothing but a modern-day medicine show. I don't  
10 believe there will ever be a rail system because there  
11 are no plans to finish the current project. The only  
12 thing I believe you can guaranty those of us in the  
13 Central valley is more unemployment by displacing those  
14 who farm and have businesses along the proposed route.  
15 I guess if you want to get a guaranty, then buy a  
16 toaster.

17 In closing, I want you to know I love trains.  
18 It's so disappointing for me to watch this project  
19 being mishandled, the tarnishing which could have been  
20 something special for future generations of  
21 Californians and those who visit our wonderful whole  
22 state. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Miss  
24 Andranigian.

25 Marvin Dean. And, Mr. Dean, I understand you

1 asked to speak with a number of your colleagues.

2 MR. DEAN: Yes. I don't have any written  
3 prepared remarks, but I have some points I wanted so  
4 speak on.

5 Again I'm here representing Kern Minority  
6 Contractors Association that's based in Bakersfield in  
7 the central valley.

8 Before I get into my, what I want to discuss,  
9 I want to also say that I highly support Item Number 6  
10 on your agenda for the unsolicited proposals. I think  
11 that's going to be a good opportunity for this  
12 high-speed rail for large proposals, and also some of  
13 the large firms that they want to propose how they  
14 might help get this thing finished, so I think that's  
15 very good that you are moving this out.

16 I'm here with other members of an  
17 association, a network of trade associations around the  
18 State of California. They're going to be speaking.  
19 And we're all basically on the same issue, and that is  
20 the lack of diversity on this project. But I want to  
21 start by saying I am still and we are all that are  
22 going to be speaking are very high supporters of this  
23 high-speed rail project. Haven't deviated from that in  
24 any way. We support this project. We think it's going  
25 to be good for the state. But we think that more needs

1 to be done in terms of diversity. You have to look at  
2 it in the face squarely. If we don't address it, it is  
3 not going to happen.

4 Now, I know that primarily the responsibility  
5 of subcontracting is the prime contractors, and the  
6 sub, prime consultants is not this board. But we  
7 believe this board can establish a policy to send the  
8 signal to the industry that you want to see diversity.  
9 If you send that, they will do it. If we're lax on it  
10 and dance around it, it's not going to happen. We want  
11 to be included. And especially now that seeing package  
12 2 and 3 is moving forward, we need to address this  
13 squarely or we're going to be left out, not only  
14 African-American communities, but these environmental  
15 justice communities along the corridor that we've all  
16 talked about, that if there's not something put in  
17 place to address those small businesses in those  
18 communities, people of color, they're not going to be  
19 included in this project.

20 What's in place, and I want to say I'm very  
21 thankful for this board and the staff of the Small  
22 Business program and the 30 percent goal and all of  
23 that that we're doing, the Small Business Council, but  
24 that's not enough. More needs to be done. And what  
25 we're going to do later is suggest to staff some

1 recommendations how we can improve and build on that  
2 and come up with some suggestions instead of criticism.

3 And let me say in closing, you all know that  
4 most of the time, and I was here when they hired Van  
5 Ark, the very first thing, and I think Miss Lynn knows  
6 that, when we hired Van Ark I welcomed him here, I  
7 addressed his problem, and I said we need to look at  
8 the century freeway project as a model that we need to  
9 use as a concept, because that was a good model,  
10 because, you know, Miss Lynn, that I've been speaking  
11 on that a long time, and most of the time I'm the only  
12 person of color that speaks to this issue.

13 And I was told at the last meeting in  
14 Sacramento when I raised this issue, by a white person  
15 in the audience, and I think everybody, all my members,  
16 everybody, they said, "You know what? We see you up  
17 here all the time, but there need to be more people to  
18 show that this is an issue."

19 So for that reason I took that back to my  
20 members and that's why we have a broad selection around  
21 the state. And I want to make sure, and I've said this  
22 to Jeff, I've said this to Tom, and I've said this to  
23 the Chairman, we're not here to burn the house down; we  
24 are not here to bad-mouth, beat up anybody. We just  
25 want to be included in the process, that's all.

1 Because if you look at small business, small business  
2 is any firm that's 100 employees and 14 million  
3 dollars. That's not minority business. So we get  
4 buried in the numbers if we don't look at that. And  
5 that's all this is about, so.

6 And I know that your challenge is getting  
7 this project built. And it's our concern to bring the  
8 attention keep it before you so it doesn't get buried  
9 in the process. So don't take this criticism. We want  
10 to be included and we want to help. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: And we understand,  
12 Mr. Dean. Thank you very much. And I understand you  
13 have some other people who wanted to speak in concert  
14 with you, so I'm going to go right through this list.  
15 And I'm sorry, sir, I'm having trouble with the first  
16 name, but Mr. Daazim?

17 MR. HAMED: Daazim Hamed.

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Is it i-z?

19 MR. HAMED: N-a-a-z-i-m.

20 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Oh, that 'm' got cut off.

21 MR. HAMED: Good morning to the Honorable  
22 Chairman and board members. My name is Daazim Hamed.  
23 I'm the President of the San Joaquin Minority and Black  
24 Contractors Association. We represent a group of  
25 contractors, specialized trades, security services,

1 transportation and real estate brokers in the San  
2 Joaquin Valley, covering the geographical area from  
3 Sacramento, Fresno, down to Bakersfield, and then  
4 working with Mr. Dean in Bakersfield; and we also have  
5 a representative here today from the Los Angeles area.

6 And what we've been doing over the last year  
7 is we realize to get into a big business operation such  
8 as this, we know we're going to have to link with the  
9 primes, but also we want the High-Speed Rail Board to  
10 know that we are in existence; we've been advocating  
11 our group, putting them together so that the resources  
12 are there, the minority resources are there and they  
13 can pull on and go into our pool and take excess.

14 We also are a member of a consortium of a  
15 network of service providers from across the state.  
16 They're here today. And we worked with Mr. Marvin Dean  
17 over the last year; in fact, we considered him our  
18 senior consultant in helping to keep us abreast in  
19 what's going on in the High-Speed. And if anybody  
20 should get a contract, somebody should find a way to  
21 get this guy a job.

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: And then he wouldn't be  
23 able to appear before the board.

24 MR. HAMED: He wouldn't mind. I'll take over  
25 for him.

1           Anyway, we're concerned about access to  
2           contracts for our members. I know there are  
3           methodologies that are in place, and we're going to  
4           study to make sure that we're following the right  
5           protocols. I think the second guy that came in kind of  
6           gave us direction this morning. We want to increase  
7           the minority participation in all phases of the  
8           High-Speed Rail, and especially those living in the  
9           environmental justice areas.

10           We support the great work that you're doing.  
11           We think that you are bringing jobs to the valley. We  
12           just want to make sure that our members get some of  
13           that work.

14           Thank you very much.

15           CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

16           Next is Gary Shelton, followed by Wanda  
17           Rogers.

18           MR. SHELTON: Good morning, Honorable  
19           Chairman, Board Members, audience.

20           We do want to be represented on this project,  
21           not because we're small and disadvantaged, but because  
22           we can deliver value to the project. Just recently,  
23           last week, I had the pleasure of meeting with your  
24           design prime contractor team and saw what appeared to  
25           be another good-faith effort. I do not see any

1 minority firms being represented in their commitment to  
2 help reach your goal.

3 I would like to say that small and  
4 disadvantaged does not mean less than. It means that  
5 we're agile. I know firsthand my company competed very  
6 effectively with AT&T, the largest telephone company in  
7 the nation, for the Department of Defense business; the  
8 White House, when Bill Clinton made the telephone call  
9 he was using our telephone service.

10 I know the perception in our nation is not  
11 that an African-American owned telephone company will  
12 provide telephone service at that time, but it was. We  
13 can deliver value on this project. We can help reduce  
14 the costs. We can increase the speed of delivery at  
15 completion of the project. We can increase the quality  
16 of the project and the safety. We just want an  
17 opportunity to compete, just like everyone else.

18 Thank you very much for your time.

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

20 Miss Wanda Rogers, followed by Robert Jones.

21 MS. ROGERS: Good morning, Board. Thank you  
22 so much for this opportunity. I've traveled from San  
23 Diego. I am a small, minority-owned woman business of  
24 a staffing agency for construction workers, architects  
25 and engineers.

1           There is a disparity, truly, for women that  
2           are African-American to proceed on this project. I've  
3           been following this project. And I'm also a member of  
4           Kern minority. However, in San Diego, we have 44  
5           African-American firms that are certified, DBE  
6           certified. Four of them are women, and I am one.

7           So it is compelling to me and interesting  
8           that as an African-American woman and with this project  
9           being a billion dollars, I can't even receive a  
10          portion. The prime contractor has not reached out to  
11          me. I'm in their database. I haven't received  
12          anything in regards to RPs, RQ. There's nothing.

13          And so, I'm asking this board to consider to  
14          change it from small business to adding a portion for  
15          small, minority-owned or woman minority-owned  
16          businesses. There are not many in the State of  
17          California. There are 1,001 businesses certified. And  
18          I know that throughout California you have a small  
19          percentage that are women.

20          So, I am asking you to really reconsider how  
21          you look at this project and use minorities. Thank  
22          you.

23                 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much. I  
24                 might ask the staff, I don't know if Miss Rogers has  
25                 been in contact with Mr. Padilla, our small business

1 advocate, but I want to make sure that you are fully  
2 aware of the work that we are doing in those areas to  
3 move beyond the small business definition.

4 MS. ROGERS: I'll just real quickly address  
5 that. I do know about Robert Padilla. I have reached  
6 out, with no effort. Truly, I am saying to you that  
7 anything that I have said or done has fallen on deaf  
8 ears.

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right. We're going to  
10 make sure that someone follows up with you.

11 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Mr. Jones.

13 MR. JONES: Good morning, Honorable Chair and  
14 Board Members. My name is Robert Jones. I'm the  
15 president, majority owner of Creegan & D'Angelo, a  
16 57-year-old civil and structural engineering firm out  
17 of the Bay area.

18 Today I am here representing my colleagues,  
19 other African-American A&E firms, primarily in  
20 Sacramento and the Bay area. And my concern is and the  
21 request that I would make to the board today is to  
22 increase the diversity among the A&E firms that are  
23 constructing and contracting with the High-Speed Rail.  
24 A similar message or request has been made by my  
25 colleagues who are here today with me.

1           And I would like to start out by saying we  
2 understand that we're responsible for doing our  
3 marketing. And we have in fact reached out to the  
4 primes. We've gotten -- we've gone to their open  
5 houses. We've gotten in their databases. We've gotten  
6 all of the small business certifications, all the  
7 disadvantaged business certifications. We've  
8 identified key people within their organizations. And  
9 we spend countless time and money and get little or no  
10 response.

11           And I'm here to tell you today that the, the  
12 good-faith effort is not going to make you reach your  
13 goals. The board is going to have to insist upon these  
14 primes start at the very beginning and not kick the can  
15 down the road in terms of identifying early on how  
16 they're going to meet those goals.

17           And I've read some of the reports, and quite  
18 frankly, it was very difficult for me to identify the  
19 30 percent in those plans. And furthermore, I was kind  
20 of astonished that I didn't see any African-American  
21 firms on that list at all.

22           And I will leave you with that thought today,  
23 that it will take more than a good-faith effort to meet  
24 your 30 percent goals.

25           CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Jones.

1 MR. ROSSI: Mr. Chair? Comment on that a  
2 second?

3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I'm sorry, did you want to  
4 ask a question? Yes, Mr. Rossi.

5 MR. ROSSI: Given what I just heard --

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Just make sure we have a  
7 microphone for Mr. Rossi.

8 MR. ROSSI: Given what I just heard, I'd like  
9 to hear from staff, or I'm willing to wait for a  
10 report, I'd like to see the numbers myself. Okay?

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Mr. Rossi, I had a sidebar  
12 with our CEO a moment ago, and he had actually  
13 indicated that he wanted to come back to the board with  
14 a report at the next meeting on this.

15 MS. PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Mr. Chair, I would just  
16 offer, I echo that. I think we're hearing very clearly  
17 some mismatch in the marketplace. And as a person  
18 who's going through her DBE process, I'm particularly  
19 sensitive to that. So I hope that we kind of get an  
20 update as to where we are with our goals and our  
21 efforts.

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: And let me just also say,  
23 I last week gave a speech to an Asian-American group in  
24 San Francisco and was hearing similar stories. And  
25 even in a city as progressive as San Francisco, they're

1 building a central subway project, and the good-faith  
2 efforts led to what they were telling me was a zero  
3 participation rate.

4 And so, I think we hear very clearly what the  
5 issue is there that is being raised.

6 Let's continue with the speakers. Nate  
7 Williams. That's the next card I have.

8 Mr. Williams, good morning.

9 MR. WILLIAMS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and  
10 Board. My name is Nate Williams with the Safety  
11 Environmental Consulting. We're located here in  
12 Southern California. We provide safety, professional  
13 safety training and environmental services. We have  
14 worked for the ACTA, Alameda Corridor Transportation  
15 Authority, OCTA and MTA. We're currently working for  
16 the Alameda Corridor East on the grade separation  
17 project. We're familiar with Union Pacific and the  
18 railroad requirements.

19 We are concerned about the public protection  
20 on jobs of this nature, and also project protection and  
21 protecting the environment. We are capable and we are  
22 able and we can meet the goals. And we would like to  
23 just have the opportunity to do so. And we welcome the  
24 Authority.

25 Thank you.

1                   CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

2                   The next speaker I have is Anarhanda Mushada.

3                   MR. MUSHADA: Yes, that's correct.

4                   Good morning, everyone. As you know, my name  
5 is Anarhanda Mushada, and I represent the San Joaquin  
6 Valley Contractors Association in Los Angeles.

7                   And I basically wanted to echo what everyone  
8 was saying, is that we have equal representation. It  
9 would be really wonderful when things get to a point  
10 where it does not involve the color, but involve your  
11 ability to deliver and involve the content of the  
12 character, expertise you offer. And that's what we  
13 need to get to. Sometimes it's just a state of  
14 consciousness where people don't even think or consider  
15 someone because of their race, automatically just  
16 overlook that.

17                  So we want to be able to have the opportunity  
18 to convince what we call small, disadvantaged; small  
19 because we haven't had the opportunity, disadvantaged  
20 because we haven't had the ability to take advantages  
21 of programs like this. So this is what we want to do.

22                  I also represent AFSPA, which is Angel Force  
23 Special Protection Agency. That's my company located  
24 in Los Angeles. And we provide security services,  
25 consulting and training. And we have the Los Angeles

1 branch, is much as like in the San Joaquin Valley,  
2 Black Contractors Association.

3 So we just want the opportunity to be fully  
4 included and to move forward with this project and let  
5 our deeds and our services speak for themselves. Thank  
6 you.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Mushada.

8 Mr. Dean, that's the last card I have from  
9 members of your group? I just wanted to make sure I  
10 didn't miss anybody.

11 Okay. Thank you very much, all of you, for  
12 coming.

13 Next we do have another group of people who  
14 have asked to speak together, and those are citizens  
15 from the City of Santa Clarita. And we'll start with  
16 Councilwoman Marsha McLeon.

17 MS. MCLEON: Hi. Good morning. Thank you so  
18 much for hearing us together. A couple of our people  
19 needed to leave because they had to catch the 11:20  
20 train back, because the next train isn't until 1:55.  
21 So.

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: We're trying to fix that.

23 MS. MCLEON: That's why we need more trains.  
24 Thank you.

25 My name is Marsha McLeon and I'm a

1 Councilwoman for the City of Santa Clarita.

2 And first of all, I would like to express my  
3 appreciation to Executive Director Jeff Morales and  
4 Southern California Regional Director Michelle Boehm  
5 for their willingness to personally meet at my request  
6 with members of the City Council and city staff and  
7 some of our residents discussing our concerns and  
8 keeping us informed about the progress of the project  
9 as it impacts Santa Clarita.

10 I'm very pleased to hear that your staff is  
11 recommending the inclusion of the tunnel extension. We  
12 had recommended another two miles to miss our homes  
13 alternative for the eastern area of Santa Clarita in  
14 the environmental documents. I encourage you to please  
15 support the inclusion of the tunnel extension option in  
16 the future supplemental alternative analysis.

17 However, I would also like to request that  
18 the board consider exploring a more direct tunnel  
19 alternative between the San Fernando Valley and  
20 Antelope Valley; namely, from the Bob Hope Airport out  
21 to Palmdale. A direct route. This approach would  
22 mitigate the impact to Santa Clarita altogether and  
23 other communities, as you heard, and potentially result  
24 in significantly reduced travel time for your rail  
25 passengers.

1                   And finally, I'd like to reiterate the  
2 importance of local rail and transit improvements to  
3 facilitate interconnectivity for the 250,000 plus  
4 residents of the Santa Clarita valley to the High-Speed  
5 Rail system. I appreciate your willingness to help  
6 resolve the City's concerns and find an agreeable  
7 solution to mitigate the High-Speed Rail system's  
8 effect on Santa Clarita.

9                   And I thank you so much for your  
10 consideration of my comments. If you have any  
11 questions for us, I'd be more than happy to answer  
12 them.

13                   CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Councilmember,  
14 and we certainly appreciate the opportunity to work  
15 with you and your community and will continue to do  
16 that.

17                   MS. MCLEON: Thank you very much.

18                   CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I'm sure the board  
19 appreciates your recognition of our staff work on this.

20                   MS. MCLEON: Thank you very much. And let me  
21 say the people that needed to leave represent our  
22 business community and the Chamber of Commerce. Thank  
23 you.

24                   CHAIRMAN RICHARD: well, their voices will be  
25 heard on this, so.

1 I'm going to call out these names. Some may  
2 have already left. So, Michael Hogan.

3 MR. HOGAN: Chairman Richard, Board Members.  
4 My name is Michael Hogan.

5 I guess you could say I'm sort of the  
6 epicenter of the High-Speed Rail in Santa Clarita. I  
7 am a resident on Road Runner Road in Santa Clarita, and  
8 currently both routes that are in the SAA, both options  
9 go right down my street.

10 This area is a unique area of L.A. County.  
11 It's made up of about 20 houses that are all 5 to 20  
12 acre horse properties. This would be displacing  
13 families who have lived there for an average of 20  
14 years and whose children were all born and grew up  
15 there. So it would basically be taking out a whole  
16 neighborhood.

17 I'm also an elected board member of the  
18 Sulphur Springs School District. As proposed, the two  
19 current routes are too close to two elementary schools,  
20 one of which is the oldest and operational elementary  
21 school in L.A. County, and will put over a thousand  
22 students in danger. And the sound impacts would impact  
23 the learning capabilities in a classroom. Our  
24 Assistant Superintendent, Lynn David is here. She's  
25 going to speak further to that.

1           In addition, I'm the Chairman of the Santa  
2 Clarita Valley High-Speed Rail Task Force. The purpose  
3 of forming this task force a few years ago was to reach  
4 out more to our community to inform our community about  
5 the events with the High-Speed Rail and represent the  
6 interests of the residents and businesses throughout  
7 the Santa Clarita Valley regarding the High-Speed Rail.

8           The High-Speed Rail as it is proposed passes  
9 through what's the Canyon Country portion of Santa  
10 Clarita Valley. And there is a reason why it's called  
11 Canyon Country. It is a canyon. It affects over a  
12 thousand homes on both sides. The sound impacts in the  
13 canyon of a train going by at 200 miles an hour is  
14 devastating. It will change the landscape of the east  
15 side of the Santa Clarita Valley, and the sound impacts  
16 would be irreversibly negative for thousands of  
17 residents.

18           I'm asking the board, and this is the second  
19 time I've requested this, the last time we did this in  
20 Fresno and we were totally disregarded, when you guys  
21 approved the current SAA, I'm asking that the tunnel  
22 option be put back in to save our neighborhood of Santa  
23 Clarita in Canyon Country and to eliminate the problems  
24 with or the safety issues with the schools. And I  
25 appreciate the support of our city and our businesses.

1 we do have support from all types of business entities  
2 in our valley, our City Council, developers. We are  
3 all on one front with this, with the High-Speed Rail  
4 Authority.

5 And I would also encourage that if we're able  
6 to go straight from Burbank to Palmdale, that would be  
7 a great alternative. I think it would solve a lot of  
8 headaches for you guys, as I'm sure you'd like to do  
9 that.

10 Thank you for hearing us.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

12 Next speaker from Santa Clarita is Steve  
13 Valenziano, followed by Susan Reynolds.

14 MR. VALENZIANO: Good morning, Chairman  
15 Richard, Board Members. Steve Valenziano. I live in  
16 Santa Clarita. I'm also a member of the community  
17 High-Speed Rail, the committee that Mike Hogan spoke  
18 about. And I'm also a development partner for the  
19 Vista Canyon Project, which has received entitlements  
20 from the City of Santa Clarita to be a major business  
21 and job center, at the specific location that one of  
22 the current alignments, as the train takes it right in  
23 the heart of our business center.

24 So, obviously the issue is sulphur springs  
25 school that's been addressed. The school in all

1 likelihood would have to be relocated absent the tunnel  
2 alternative. And our business center, in Vista Canyon,  
3 would frankly, given the alignments currently, would be  
4 obliterated.

5 So that I would like to thank Jeff Morales  
6 and Michelle Boehm for putting forward the  
7 recommendation. I think it's a good reason for you to  
8 take it on. As a developer I know a little something  
9 about CEQA and had my own happy experiences with it.  
10 In the inevitable CEQA litigation you would probably be  
11 forced to look at this alignment in the future. Time  
12 is money. Money is what we have done now.

13 Thank you very much for your consideration  
14 and being so responsive to our community. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

16 Next is Susan Reynolds from the Santa Clarita  
17 valley Chamber of Commerce, followed by Bob Khaisa.

18 MS. REYNOLDS: Good morning. Thank you. And  
19 thank you all for seeing us.

20 I am indeed a business owner in Santa Clarita  
21 valley and am a member of the executive board of the  
22 Chamber of Commerce there. My business is an executive  
23 coaching firm dedicated to job search and career  
24 advancement, as well as other involvement in the  
25 community.

1           You're hearing about the tremendous impact in  
2     the business community in Santa Clarita Valley, to the  
3     homes, to the ranches, to the schools. We thank staff  
4     for considering the tunneling option and bringing that  
5     forward. But now as you're hearing from others and  
6     Supervisor Antonovich, the idea that you can go direct  
7     from Palmdale to the southern terminus at Burbank would  
8     indeed possibly create a much more cost-effective  
9     concept for all parties involved, and of course  
10    speedier. So again, as you're hearing about the homes,  
11    the businesses, the ranches, the wildlife, the horses,  
12    please consider this, but with the improvements to the  
13    local connectivity, the Metro routes that would then  
14    support the revitalization. And I would like to say  
15    that that would very much support the business,  
16    commuter and commerce needs of the City of Santa  
17    Clarita.

18           Thank you so much for seeing us.

19           CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Miss Reynolds.  
20           Bob Khalsa.

21           MR. KHALSA: Good morning, Chairman Richard  
22    and Members of the Board. I am the president of  
23    Southland Regional Association of Realtors, Santa  
24    Clarita Valley Division. And I'll come straight to the  
25    point.

1           Our property values have been impacted  
2 because of disclosure requirements that the High-Speed  
3 Rail is likely to go through. That is affecting people  
4 coming in. It's already affected the people in the  
5 area. That's one.

6           The second one is we have a seismic line  
7 issue, advocate issue for which is not related to  
8 high-speed rail, but guess what? When you have two  
9 tunnels which are dominating close to our city, the  
10 aggregate from this has to come on the freeways. And  
11 the quantum is going to be enormous. It's going to be  
12 the same issue, same problems that we have.

13           The third problem is more safety. When you  
14 have so many codes and you have a code projectory for  
15 the train, it's going to cause issues such as the one  
16 that happened in Spain. We don't want another incident  
17 in our valley.

18           What we propose is what Supervisor Antonovich  
19 and Councilwoman Marsha McLeon said. Have a straight  
20 tunnel. Reduce the curves. You can maintain your  
21 speeds. You're going to drop the speed, you defeat the  
22 purpose of high-speed rail. You're going to increase  
23 the travel times even beyond four hours with the number  
24 of circuitous routes that you have to take. And I just  
25 want this aspect to be considered more from the safety

1 issue.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

4 I believe it's Spencer Leafdale; is that  
5 correct?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: He had to leave.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Lynn David,  
8 followed by Roger Horning.

9 MS. DAVID: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and  
10 board members. My name is Lynn David. I am an  
11 Assistant Superintendent of Business Services for  
12 Sulphur Springs School District and here today to  
13 represent the District's interests.

14 I appreciate the opportunity to share some  
15 facts with you about Sulphur Springs Community School  
16 and its district's concerns about the current plan to  
17 have the high-speed rail go directly above ground  
18 behind the school. Here are a few facts about Sulphur  
19 Springs School:

20 Sulphur Springs is a kindergarten through 6th  
21 grade school that houses 662 students, 38 teachers and  
22 various other staff members. The rail passes directly  
23 next to the rear of the school's property, as close as  
24 20 feet from the playground at some points. A number  
25 of classrooms are approximately 300 feet from the rail

1 line.

2 Sulphur Springs has several classes for  
3 special needs students with disabilities such as autism  
4 who are negatively affected by noise.

5 Sulphur Springs is also the oldest school in  
6 continuous operation in Los Angeles County, opening in  
7 1872 and remaining in continuous operation since that  
8 time. Therefore, it has a significant value to Santa  
9 Clarita and Los Angeles County as a historical site.

10 There are safety concerns that would  
11 adversely affect the enrollment of the school, as  
12 parents could ask for and be granted under open  
13 enrollment laws in which the parents would be allowed  
14 to remove their children from the school. Other  
15 district schools do not have the capacity at this time  
16 to house additional students. And a new school would  
17 cost approximately \$35 million.

18 While we support the goal of increasing  
19 transportation options for California citizens, the  
20 district does oppose the currently planned above-ground  
21 route because of the safety of students and staff,  
22 interruption to the instructional programs, the impact  
23 on the site and the district from transfer requests and  
24 the value as a historical site.

25 So I ask you as other members did from our

1 area to consider extending the tunnel to bypass the  
2 school or to alter the route. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much.

4 Roger Horning, followed by Dante Acosta.

5 MR. HORNING: Good morning, Chairman and  
6 Board Members. My name is Pastor Roger Horning, and I  
7 represent Evangelical Free Church of the Canyons. Our  
8 church is directly in the path of the proposed rail.  
9 And I just, you know, of course our church congregation  
10 is very concerned about the possibility of being forced  
11 to relocate. We serve families from the Antelope  
12 Valley to Northridge. Most of our, the largest  
13 concentration of our members is actually Sand Canyon.

14 The things I want to mention are the schools,  
15 Sulfur Springs and also Pine Crest, are so close to the  
16 church that when I'm sitting at my desk, I hear the  
17 bells, I hear the announcements that are being made to  
18 the students. So, the idea of a train going right past  
19 that area is really concerning.

20 In addition to that, we're really concerned  
21 just about the City of Santa Clarita will suffer many  
22 of the negative impacts of the rail without the  
23 positive elements of it. And we would just like to  
24 really encourage this board to consider the tunneling  
25 option to reduce the impact to our neighborhood.

1           Also, it's mentioned on many occasions that  
2 there are 23 homes that that are affected. And Mike  
3 mentioned earlier this is a canyon. Sound travels in  
4 the canyon. It's not just 23 homes, a church and two  
5 schools. There are many people that are significantly  
6 affected by this.

7           So, we would like to just ask that you guys  
8 really focus on the tunnel option or the realignment of  
9 the route that would avoid our neighborhood altogether.  
10 Thank you.

11           CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

12           Dante Acosta.

13           MR. ACOSTA: Thank you very much,  
14 Mr. Chairman and the Board.

15           My name is Dante Acosta. I'm a resident of  
16 Santa Clarita for 27 years, directly adjacent to the  
17 proposed property, and also a declared candidate for  
18 the Santa Clarita City Council election.

19           Although in general I am not a supporter of  
20 the High-Speed Rail project, if it is to be built, I'd  
21 like to voice my support for the following three  
22 points:

23           As was mentioned before, the tunneling  
24 option, I'd like to see that extended to mitigate the  
25 adverse effects. If you haven't traveled to the area,

1 I really encourage you. We've got a lot of local  
2 restaurants at the corner there. We've got an In and  
3 Out. You can grab a great burger and then look around  
4 the area and see what it's like, what the community is  
5 like there in the rural nature. So I'd like to really  
6 consider that, you to consider that point.

7 Also considering that the direct alignment, I  
8 think if that's considered directly from Palmdale down  
9 to the Burbank airport, what a significant time-saver  
10 it would be for, not only for the travelers, but also  
11 for perhaps cost savings to the project.

12 And then finally I'd like to reiterate that  
13 if this system is to become a reality, that the  
14 importance of that connectivity between the Santa  
15 Clarita valley and its 250,000 residents and taxpayers  
16 and the rest of the rail system, this high-speed rail  
17 system, that we're actually making these connectivity  
18 improvements so that we can move people in and out of  
19 the Santa Clarita Valley. We're not going to have the  
20 benefits of the hub there, and it's to our wonderful  
21 neighbors up in Antelope Valley, then we should be able  
22 to connect there very rapidly and very easily.

23 Once again I want to tell you I appreciate  
24 your willingness to listen to our concerns and our  
25 viewpoints, and thank you for your time.

1                   CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

2                   I apologize. I believe it's Tim Ben  
3 Boydston? I'm trying to be as precise as I can with  
4 names, and sometimes it's either mind-reading or  
5 handwritings.

6                   MR. BOYDSTON: Mr. Chairman, I assure you  
7 that it is not your problem. It is my writing.

8                   CHAIRMAN RICHARD: How did I do, sir?

9                   MR. BOYDSTON: You did very well.

10                  It's Councilman Tim Ben Boydston, and it's an  
11 honor to speak to you, Mr. Chairman and board members  
12 of the High-Speed Rail.

13                  I will just reiterate what you have heard  
14 from several of our constituents and also my fellow  
15 councilwoman Marsha McLeon, we both sit on our  
16 High-Speed Rail Subcommittee, and that is for you to  
17 consider, number one, we thank you that you are putting  
18 in a possible tunneling option that will put a tunnel  
19 underneath just about the majority of the populated  
20 area of Santa Clarita in our city. And also, if you  
21 can look at, at this time, at the possibility of just  
22 taking a straight shot from the San Fernando Valley out  
23 to Palmdale. It will save a lot of time and in the  
24 long run it may save a lot money because you won't have  
25 to worry about unhappy people suing you, not that

1 that's ever happened yet, but there you go.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Always a first time.

3 MR. BOYDSTON: There always is, Mr. Chair.  
4 So I would thank you for your time, and the best of  
5 luck to you all. And straight shot.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Councilmember.  
7 And we can count on City of Santa Clarita to do bake  
8 sales to help us.

9 MR. BOYDSTON: Whatever we can do to get rid  
10 of -- I mean --

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: That will teach me.  
12 Victor Lindenhein.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: He had to leave.  
14 All right.

15 Council members, I believe those are the last  
16 cards I have from your group. If I'm missing anybody,  
17 perhaps they can just let me know at this point.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. I think  
19 that's it.

20 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right. Let me thank  
21 all the good citizens and their leaders from Santa  
22 Clarita for spending time to come here today. I assure  
23 you that the board listens intently to these concerns  
24 and we will continue to work with you through our  
25 staff. So thank you.

1           Just finishing up with public comment, Hilary  
2 Norton, followed by Don Sepulveda.

3           MS. NORTON: Good morning. My name is Hilary  
4 Norton, and I am Executive Director of a nonprofit  
5 called FAST, Fixing Angelinos Stuck in Traffic. And as  
6 you can imagine, we have quite a lot of work to do and  
7 wanted to thank you for the work that you have been  
8 doing on the connectivity with Union Station.

9           The work, this is really a testimony on Item  
10 3, but the fact that you and your team, and I want to  
11 compliment Michelle Boehm and others who have been  
12 going to meetings with the business community to talk  
13 about the future and the promise of high-speed rail and  
14 what it will mean to Union Station and also the  
15 run-through tracks for the regional connector.

16           When I was in London this summer, going to  
17 St. Patrick's station and taking the tunnel, I was told  
18 that there is more money that's being made in economic  
19 development at the station than there is in fees on the  
20 tunnel itself. And that's really a promise for  
21 downtown Los Angeles. And we just wanted to thank you  
22 for concentrating on how high-speed rail can intersect  
23 with our goals for economic development, but also  
24 multimodal connectivity throughout the region. And  
25 just wanted to say thank you again for sharpening your

1 pencils and making sure that we were sharing the  
2 wealth.

3 Thanks again.

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

5 Don Sepulveda.

6 And while Don is coming up, I had a note that  
7 Michael Regala was speaking, but it wasn't on a green;  
8 were you intending to speak, Michael?

9 Okay, we'll call on you. Mr. Sepulveda.

10 MR. SEPULVEDA: Good morning, Mr. Chair and  
11 Members of the Board.

12 I am Don Sepulveda. I am the Executive  
13 Officer of Regional Rail here at L.A. Metro.

14 L.A. Metro appreciates the assistance that  
15 the Authority has been providing to advance the  
16 development of projects in the bookends. The  
17 partnership that has been shared by all the Southern  
18 California agencies with the High-Speed Rail Authority  
19 has been an important component in advancing high speed  
20 and passenger rail in Southern California to meet the  
21 date of 2022 for the Initial Operating Segment to the  
22 San Fernando Valley.

23 Furthermore, we support the decision to study  
24 a station with a connection to Burbank/Bob Hope  
25 Airport. As you're aware, the complementary component

1 of the high-speed rail and airports is important. A  
2 connection to Burbank/Bob Hope Airport is important for  
3 regional and statewide connectivity and coincides with  
4 work that Metro is doing with the airport for regional  
5 connectivity.

6 Metro has been advancing projects with the,  
7 on the MOU that are part of the MOU list of the  
8 advanced investment of these bookends. I want to  
9 highlight a couple of these, as these are important to  
10 our communities.

11 The Doran Street grade separation, located on  
12 the valley subdivision, is a grade separation of the  
13 Metro owned right-of-way that will serve high-speed  
14 rail as well as conventional rail, if this project is  
15 underway. This community safety and mobility project  
16 will create more than 1,600 jobs as well as eliminate  
17 hazards related to an existing at-grade crossing.  
18 These hazards include 13 accidents, including two  
19 fatalities, since 1976.

20 The Southern California Regional  
21 Interconnector Project, SCRIP, formerly known as the  
22 run-through tracks, will take four tracks at Union  
23 Station that are currently subbed and advance them out  
24 through the south end of the station, reconnecting them  
25 up to the tracks along the main line. This will create

1 a run-through situation for conventional rail in the,  
2 at the station. We are expecting to release the RFP  
3 to, Request For Proposal, to update the environmental  
4 document as well as advance the final design of this  
5 project next week.

6 Just -- I'll wrap it up.

7 This project is necessary for the  
8 introduction of high-speed rail to the region, as well  
9 as the growing passenger rail service along the second  
10 busiest passenger rail corridor in the nation. This  
11 project when completed will allow trains to flow easily  
12 through Union Station, adding 40 to 50 percent capacity  
13 to a station that is currently nearing capacity. This  
14 will create a significant number of one-seat rides,  
15 adding further convenience to people using this  
16 important transportation system. Combined with our  
17 master planning efforts this project will modernize  
18 Union Station.

19 And finally, we appreciate the partnership  
20 with your Authority. Together we are advancing  
21 projects that will provide necessary advance work for  
22 the high-speed rail system. This allows us to make  
23 that challenging IOS schedule to the San Fernando  
24 valley in 2022. These projects also have independent  
25 utility in the short term by enhancing the safety in

1 our communities and significantly improving the  
2 mobility of the region.

3 Thank you very much.

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Sepulveda,  
5 and appreciate your comments about the working  
6 relationship. It's been really first-rate, and we are  
7 very excited about going forward.

8 MR. SEPULVEDA: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Michael Regala, followed  
10 by Frank Oliveira, followed by Ron Miller, and then  
11 Stan Opatowsky. And that's it.

12 MR. REGALA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sorry,  
13 I think they ran out of that green paper for the  
14 submissions, so I'm here from the private sector to try  
15 to talk about the unsolicited proposal. Maybe we can  
16 talk about the green paper problem you're having.

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: It just occurred to  
18 me that -- never mind. I won't even go there.

19 MR. REGALA: I did want to make a comment on  
20 the unsolicited proposal policy you're considering.  
21 First, I congratulate you on taking the initiative.  
22 Some of the best transportation agencies in the U.S.  
23 and around the world allow such proposals from the  
24 private sector so as to get the best ideas,  
25 innovations. Some of the clients I represent have in

1 fact contributed unsolicited proposals in other states,  
2 some of the ones you're using as models here. And we  
3 learned a few things in terms of what makes them more  
4 attractive and useful to both public and the private  
5 sector.

6 A couple points. I want to clearly state  
7 procedure for submissions and for evaluation by the  
8 agency. Two, clear indications of how the procurement  
9 process will take place, assuming the proposal is  
10 accepted. And three, a policy to protect certain types  
11 of data and proprietary information from being released  
12 in the competition.

13 And then one other point would be that to  
14 consider having some kind of recognition or incentive  
15 for the group submitting the proposal; for example,  
16 some have allowed the right to match the lowest offer  
17 obtained from the procurement process.

18 More importantly, I think this is an ideal  
19 time to move this process forward. Now that you've  
20 laid out your plans clear for the Central valley, many  
21 of us are looking at the Bakersfield to L.A. area as an  
22 opportunity for more private sector involvement. I  
23 know that there are routes that are looked at, segments  
24 through connecting Union Station. It's potentially  
25 attractive for investment from public-private

1 partnerships.

2 We think that there may be an opportunity for  
3 significant cost savings on the construction side  
4 through innovative approaches and significant potential  
5 for revenue from the higher ridership we expect in the  
6 L.A. area. I can tell you that there's been some  
7 interest in looking at not only the segments through  
8 the mountains, but also segments that would connect  
9 L.A. to Palmdale and on to Las Vegas, and from L.A. to  
10 Anaheim, and Anaheim to San Diego, primarily because of  
11 the substantial ridership we expect to see in those  
12 corridors.

13 As always, the actual details of this policy  
14 and the procedures will determine how much interest  
15 there is from the private sector. I encourage the  
16 Authority to look for the broadest authority possible  
17 to allow for a variety of proposals to be submitted,  
18 including P3s, concessions and financing that could  
19 expedite construction in these key areas.

20 We stand ready to provide further comment on  
21 this proposal and to consider contributing proposals to  
22 the process once the policy is clearly defined.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. And if I could  
24 prevail on you in the same way I asked Mr. Barna if he  
25 could just note out a couple of the specific things

1 that you think would, that you've talked about that you  
2 think would make the policy more effective, we'd  
3 appreciate that as we go forward. We're very serious  
4 about this.

5 Frank Oliveira, followed by Ron Miller and  
6 Stan Opatowsky.

7 Mr. Oliveira, good morning.

8 MR. OLIVEIRA: Good morning. My name is  
9 Frank Oliveira. I'm with the Citizens For California  
10 High-Speed Rail Accountability.

11 I'd like to discuss the foundation of this  
12 visionary project and to discuss your past and  
13 continuing mistakes that are not being corrected;  
14 mistakes that unfortunately will sink this project as  
15 the Titanic sits on the bottom of the cold, dark  
16 Atlantic. Mud, waste water and sand and bad planning  
17 will do this.

18 Coordination with local jurisdictions is  
19 required by federal law. Your agency has failed to do  
20 this with Kings County and has not done that to date.  
21 Kings County is still missing approximately 60  
22 questions, simple questions, that they asked of the  
23 High-Speed Rail Authority on April, 2011. How can  
24 anyone believe that you can successfully build 800  
25 miles of track if you can't even answer 60 questions

1 about 28 miles of it?

2 It is critical that this happens before the  
3 project proceeds through our county and our community.  
4 As this project proceeds forward spending only your  
5 federal partner's funds, we demand that all relevant  
6 state and federal laws are followed.

7 You represent the people of the state, the  
8 people in this state and their interests. We live here  
9 also. We are part of this state. Do your job or  
10 resign.

11 You must recirculate the Fresno to  
12 Bakersfield EIS to allow local community input on  
13 serious geological complications that your program  
14 management reports only now are conceding that are  
15 occurring on both routes through Kings County.

16 The project is facing rapidly sinking ground;  
17 easily compacting soils; wide, deep sand streaks and  
18 high water tables that will almost be impossible to  
19 build 220-mile-per-hour track beds on and will  
20 drastically increase your costs. This is what happens  
21 when you ignore the locals. Maybe the ICS will be  
22 shortened again to run only from Madera to Corcoran  
23 because of these costs. How will that work for the  
24 FRA's need for independent utilities in their variable  
25 requirements? That will be a tough one for them to

1 sell to Congress, Congressional oversight, and the  
2 courts and the SUB. Perhaps real coordination will,  
3 with the affected communities, will have spared this  
4 latent process potentially embarrassing problems.

5 We have always known about these problems.  
6 This board and their staff just decided to not include  
7 us in the planning in this project. And that was in  
8 conflict with the federal laws pertaining to  
9 environmental justice.

10 Recirculate the EIS. Face reality. Tell the  
11 truth. Include what we know your staff knows is the  
12 law.

13 Your new website tends to hide critical  
14 documents. This time please release the technical  
15 reports. We tend to find things in the technical  
16 reports that your staff are not publicly reporting to  
17 you, and that we suspect you are choosing to ignore  
18 these project-ending facts as everyone tries to move  
19 forward to make the data fit the story line. You can  
20 only fake it so long before you have to make something.  
21 Let's just comply with law. After all, it's the way it  
22 is in a nation of laws.

23 On that note, we've been trying to get  
24 information that we can't find on your website that  
25 used to be on your website before you changed your

1 website. We've made numerous requests. It's been  
2 months. Allen Scott has three requests here. I'd like  
3 to give them to you. All we want are the documents so  
4 we can peruse these problems a little bit deeper. Can  
5 we have that?

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Why don't you give the  
7 material to our secretary.

8 MR. OLIVEIRA: Thank you very much for  
9 hearing me on it.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Sure.

11 Okay. Ron Miller. And I hope I've got this  
12 right, Stan Opatowsky is our last speaker.

13 MR. MILLER: Good morning. I'm Ron Miller,  
14 Executive Secretary of the Los Angeles and Orange  
15 County Building and Construction Trades Council. We  
16 represent 140,000 craftsmen and women and 52 affiliated  
17 local unions in 14 trades.

18 We strongly support the building of the  
19 High-Speed Rail in California. It will be built in an  
20 agreement with the building trades that guaranties  
21 representation and fair wages to all the workers that  
22 work on the project, as well as good health benefits  
23 and retirement. This is still a private sector project  
24 though; lowest bid. Will offer thousands of jobs to  
25 people with the chance to become apprentices and start

1 a career in the building trades.

2 High-speed rail is badly needed in  
3 California. Our freeways and our airports are clogged  
4 congested. High-speed rail will make our state more  
5 protective and drive the economy. We will make  
6 high-speed rail a reality for the first time in this  
7 country. High-speed rail is the next great investment  
8 in California.

9 I want to thank Governor Brown, the  
10 legislature and High-Speed Rail Authority for your  
11 continued efficacy. You see merit in highly-skilled  
12 craftsmen and women through apprenticeship.

13 Thank you very much. And let's get this  
14 project moving.

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

16 The last speaker card I have is for Stan  
17 Opatowsky.

18 Sir, I hope I pronounced your name correctly.

19 MR. OPATOWSKY: Perfectly.

20 Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board: I am a  
21 stakeholder in High-Speed Rail. I've been going to the  
22 meetings I guess almost 10 years. I'm getting  
23 frustrated when I hear about China and what is  
24 happening there. It was only a few months ago when  
25 they opened another 1,500 miles of high-speed rail, to

1 give them a total of about 5,000 miles.

2 Now, we know that if the amount of political  
3 and documentation and so on had been done back in, when  
4 the rail line from Omaha, Nebraska to Sacramento was  
5 built in the 1860s, they probably never would have  
6 gotten it done. They had to go through the mountains.  
7 But it was done.

8 The same thing can be done here. The  
9 important thing is to get the job going. And I'd like  
10 to know when the first section will be built. We heard  
11 it was going to start about this time. I'm wondering  
12 exactly when it actually will start. It's very  
13 important to get it started, because it's something  
14 we'll find will be a big benefit to California. And it  
15 will tie the state together. I'm tired of all this  
16 nonsense of northern California getting all the federal  
17 transportation money and the southern California having  
18 to fight for it. Let's get the job done.

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

20 (Applause.)

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. So with that, that  
22 concludes our public comment period. We'll now move to  
23 the regular agenda order. The very first item will be the  
24 approval of the minutes from the last meeting.

25 MR. ROSSI: So moved.

1 MS. SCHENK: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: It's moved by Mr. Rossi  
3 and seconded by Miss Schenk and Mr. Hartnett.

4 will the secretary please call the roll.

5 MS. NIEBEL: Vice-Chair Richards.

6 MR. RICHARDS: Yes.

7 MS. NIEBEL: Vice-Chair Hartnett.

8 MR. HARTNETT: Yes.

9 MS. NIEBEL: Mr. Umberg.

10 MR. UMBERG: Not voting.

11 MS. NIEBEL: Mr. Rossi.

12 MR. ROSSI: Yes.

13 MS. NIEBEL: Miss Schenk.

14 MS. SCHENK: Yes.

15 MS. NIEBEL: Miss Perez-Estolano.

16 MS. PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Yes.

17 MS. NIEBEL: Mr. Henning.

18 MR. HENNING: Yes.

19 MS. NIEBEL: Mr. Frank.

20 Chairman Richard.

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes.

22 We are going to switch Items 2 and 3 on the  
23 agenda. But before we do, I'm going to exercise the  
24 Chair's prerogative to make one brief statement.

25 I tend to be very definite about not

1 commenting and urging my colleagues not to comment  
2 during public comment sessions because that's the time  
3 for the public to come and speak to us. One of the  
4 things that's difficult sometimes is that people make  
5 statements, and our job is to listen. So what that  
6 means is we don't, we don't try to interfere with the  
7 public's presentation.

8 But I do think it's important for us to make  
9 sure that factual allegations that are made are not  
10 left to stand on the record. And Mr. Oliveira just  
11 made a statement, and Mr. Oliveira knows that I have  
12 great personal respect and affection for him, but he  
13 made the statement that the County of Kings had sent a  
14 letter with 60 questions and the High-Speed Rail  
15 Authority had never responded to that. And I just need  
16 to say that that is not correct; that in fact I  
17 personally had appeared, along with my colleague  
18 Vice-Chair Tom Richards, at Kings County at the Board  
19 of Supervisors, and I have to say I probably spent more  
20 time in Kings County with that Board of Supervisors  
21 than any other local body in the two years I've been on  
22 this board.

23 When I arrived there, I found that in fact  
24 they had sent a letter with 60 questions that had gone  
25 unanswered for a year. And the first thing we set

1 about doing was working with our staff. And we  
2 provided very detailed answers to all of those  
3 questions.

4 We continue to try to work hard in Kings  
5 County. I was there in June. In fact, at this point I  
6 would say that the ball is in their court on things  
7 that we have offered in terms of reimbursable  
8 agreements and so forth. It's our desire to work  
9 cooperatively with them.

10 So, I'm sorry, I could just not let stand the  
11 notion that this body had been completely unresponsive  
12 to a sister governmental agency when in fact we have  
13 been.

14 So with that, we will move to the reordered  
15 Item Number 3, which is a report from the San Diego  
16 Association of Governments on their TIGER Grant Award.

17 And before we ask Michelle Boehm to give a  
18 report, I'd like to welcome Gary Gallegos, the very  
19 respected leader of SANDAG, to make a few remarks.

20 MR. GALLEGOS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and  
21 Members of the Authority.

22 Again, my name is Gary Gallegos. I am the  
23 Executive Director for the San Diego Association of  
24 Governments. And I come before you this morning to  
25 give you an update on the successful TIGER grant that

1 will impact our, what we call our LOSSAN corridor,  
2 which is the second busiest rail corridor in the  
3 country. And I think it's of great importance in terms  
4 of connecting with the work that you all are doing on  
5 the High-Speed Rail site.

6 And I wanted to highlight about a year ago, a  
7 little longer, the Southern California Transportation  
8 Authorities got together, agencies, and developed an  
9 MOU which ultimately the High-Speed Rail Authority  
10 became part of in essence, stating that we would  
11 advocate with each other to try to -- or advocate  
12 together to try to get more transportation dollars to  
13 meet our ever-growing rail needs in Southern  
14 California.

15 And I'm pleased to say that we -- and I want  
16 to thank you for your support of that. I think the  
17 Authority's letter made a difference. We were -- no  
18 surprise to the Rail Authority how hard it is to get  
19 federal funds, particularly as federal resources tend  
20 to be shrinking, not growing. But we were successful  
21 in getting a \$14 million TIGER grant. We were one of  
22 52 that were awarded in this fifth cycle nationally,  
23 only two in California. These funds will allow us to  
24 replace four timber trestle bridges that were built in  
25 the '20s and '30s, so it will allow us to bring this

1 very important passenger freight rail up to a better  
2 state of repair.

3 And how that ties in to some of the other  
4 work we're doing, San Diego is currently working on  
5 about 22 projects, totaling roughly about \$400 million  
6 that will allow us to double track a lot of the rail in  
7 San Diego County that is still single track, allow us  
8 to have better connections to Orange County and  
9 ultimately Los Angeles and ultimately to the work that  
10 you're doing with High-Speed Rail.

11 So we wanted this opportunity to again say  
12 thank you to be able to update you on the fact that we  
13 were successful here, and take this opportunity, and I  
14 know Member Schenk would not let me get away with this  
15 without saying that while you are working on your  
16 stuff, always keep your eye on that last phase and the  
17 second phase. In San Diego, I still continue to be  
18 bullish and believe that will only strengthen our  
19 efforts of building high-speed rail in California and  
20 connecting the growing populations that we have in  
21 Southern California between not only San Diego County,  
22 but Riverside County, San Bernardino County, Los  
23 Angeles and Orange County.

24 So, Mr. Chairman, just wanted to say thank  
25 you, and say thank you to the board for your support.

1 we hope we'll continue to see this kind of support put  
2 together. We need to try to find how to reach more  
3 transportation dollars particularly for rail in our  
4 state.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Gallegos.  
6 Congratulations on the award. It's well-deserved.

7 And, you know, the earlier commentary, we'll  
8 have a staff report on the unsolicited proposal policy.  
9 Keep your eye on that. It may be a good way to  
10 accelerate things moving from San Diego to Los Angeles.

11 MR. GALLEGOS: We will do that. Thank you  
12 very much.

13 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Good to see you.  
14 We are going to get a staff report on this  
15 from Miss Boehm? She's looking a little uncertain.

16 MR. MORALES: Mr. Chairman, while we're  
17 waiting, while Michelle is getting set up, I will just  
18 preface this, we're just meeting in Southern California  
19 just once this year. We did want to provide a general  
20 update on where we are on the program throughout  
21 Southern California for the benefit of the board and  
22 the public.

23 And so there's no action associated with this  
24 presentation, but just a quick update on the status of  
25 the project. Some of the issues certainly we've heard

1 about during the public comment period.

2 I do want to say we've been focusing, as we  
3 have elsewhere in the state, on greater flexibility and  
4 coordination with locals and with regional  
5 decision-making. And you'll see that reflected in this  
6 presentation.

7 MS. BOEHM: Thank you.

8 Chairman, Board Members:

9 Over the course of the past year we have been  
10 all across southern California meeting with elected  
11 officials, agencies, businesses and residents to  
12 communicate the challenges of the project, and the  
13 clarity of our focus on meeting those challenges. We  
14 have spent time listening to stakeholders to understand  
15 the perspective and collect ideas.

16 Through these meetings we have been clear in  
17 our commitment to apply a flexible, collaborative  
18 approach to all our activities in order to develop and  
19 implement a system that aligns with regional plans,  
20 minimizes community environmental impacts, delivers  
21 benefits sooner, and leverages investments to the  
22 maximum extent possible.

23 As we listened to partners and stakeholders,  
24 we've sharpened our pencils and begun to refine our  
25 alignments and lay the foundation for a fully

1 integrated intermodal rail network. And I'd like to  
2 share with you a few of the highlights from each of our  
3 sections.

4 The first section in Southern California, the  
5 Bakersfield to Palmdale section, which you can see up  
6 here on the board, spans over 80 miles across the  
7 Tehachapis from Kern County to Antelope Valley. And we  
8 are meeting the challenge there to close the current  
9 passenger rail gap between Los Angeles and Bakersfield.

10 A comprehensive stakeholder engagement  
11 process and multiple site visits have brought forward  
12 ideas that help further reduce impacts. In the north,  
13 in the area on the north end of the Tehachapis we have  
14 been able to talk with stakeholders in the Edison area  
15 and minimize impacts to the agricultural businesses and  
16 the communities in that area.

17 As you begin to traverse through the  
18 Tehachapis, within the City of Tehachapi we have spoken  
19 with them and been able to avoid planned development in  
20 that area.

21 As you exit the Tehachapis into the Antelope  
22 Valley, we have spoken with the County of Kern and  
23 numerous business owners about the clean energy  
24 resources there, the windmills and solar farms, and we  
25 are able to avoid impacting those critical green energy

1 generating facilities. And as we move into the  
2 Antelope Valley and we go through the City of Lancaster  
3 where they have a significant smart and green street  
4 redevelopment process underway, we are able to avoid  
5 impacts to that development.

6 Moving south now to the Palmdale to  
7 Los Angeles Union Station section. This section spans  
8 over 60 miles and we are bringing high-speed rail from  
9 the Antelope Valley into the highly urban Los Angeles  
10 environment, ultimately to Los Angeles Union Station.  
11 Over the past year we have done a lot of work in this  
12 section. We have worked collaboratively with the City  
13 of Palmdale and Los Angeles Metro to coordinate our  
14 activities with new projects being planned adjacent to  
15 the Palmdale Transportation Center up at the top of the  
16 map there. These new projects are transforming that  
17 Palmdale Transportation Center into an exciting  
18 intermodal hub with complementary rail, bus and  
19 east-west high-speed rail connections, thus making it  
20 the best location for the high speed station.

21 We have talked to stakeholders and made  
22 multiple site visits to the Acton, Agua Dulce and Santa  
23 Clarita area to fully understand the complexities.  
24 This is as you move down now through and go towards the  
25 left on the screen.

1           Our technical teams continue to refine the  
2 alignments in this area to minimize impacts. As an  
3 example, in Santa Clarita this work includes study of  
4 three options in the Sand Canyon area that include a  
5 variety of combinations of upgrade and tunnel  
6 configurations.

7           Now as you go around the turn there, on the  
8 far left and into the San Fernando Valley, we have  
9 carefully evaluated the locations in the San Fernando  
10 valley suitable as the last station along the line  
11 during the IOS phase of the project. Key stakeholders  
12 and planning analysis suggest that the Buena Vista  
13 Burbank location is the most suitable location for this  
14 station because of compatible land use and direct  
15 connectivity to rail, bus and air transportation.

16           Moving further down now as we move into the  
17 Los Angeles Union Station area, at the bottom of the  
18 map we have corroborated with Los Angeles Metro as they  
19 conduct a master planning process to reimagine  
20 Los Angeles Union Station and its surroundings. The  
21 documents also look at the opportunities the site  
22 presents, have brought forward several interesting  
23 concepts aimed at integrating all transportation  
24 elements on the campus and creating an internationally  
25 recognized destination for the City of Los Angeles.

1           Finally, we have also been corroborating with  
2 Los Angeles Metro on the Southern California Regional  
3 Interconnector Project, which Don spoke to you about  
4 earlier. This transformative project tops the list of  
5 California bookend projects and is moving forward  
6 quickly in order to improve the operation, safety and  
7 reliability of the passenger rail system in Southern  
8 California and pave the way for high-speed rail.

9           Moving down to the next section, Los Angeles  
10 to Anaheim. In the Los Angeles to Anaheim section, we  
11 parallel the LOSSAN corridor for 30 miles between  
12 Los Angeles Union Station up at the top down to  
13 Anaheim, roughly two-thirds of the way down and towards  
14 the right-hand side. During our work here in the last  
15 year we have been working in collaboration with the  
16 gateway cities to develop ideas to refine the alignment  
17 and minimize impacts outside of the current corridor  
18 right-of-way. We also continue in our collaboration  
19 with the City of Anaheim, who you heard from earlier,  
20 as they construct ARTIC on time and on budget and  
21 create the ultimate southern terminus of our Phase 1  
22 system.

23           And moving south, or moving east and south  
24 again to our Los Angeles to San Diego section, which is  
25 about 167 miles from Union Station up at the top and

1 left-hand side all the way down to the San Diego  
2 International Airport down at the bottom. This  
3 travels, as you can see, east through the San Gabriel  
4 valley and San Bernardino, then south through Riverside  
5 and finally into the San Diego area.

6 We have been working in close collaboration  
7 with the Southern California ICG, a multi-agency task  
8 force, to develop solutions here. Highlights of these  
9 activities include the production and completion of a  
10 draft refinement report that addresses stakeholder  
11 comments about 18 of the most challenging areas along  
12 the alignment and brings forward fresh ideas to address  
13 these challenges. As we move this forward, we will be  
14 bringing on the select -- we have later today, the  
15 selection of a new consultant team to help us move  
16 these efforts forward. And we also look forward to  
17 re-energizing this important work by renewing the focus  
18 on integration with new services and service  
19 frequencies all along this alignment and incorporating  
20 value capture and transportation-oriented development  
21 ideas.

22 Finally, our team has succeeded by  
23 strengthening partnerships with local transportation  
24 agencies like our host Metro, and your former speaker  
25 Gary Gallegos with SANDAG, who share our commitment to

1 plan a fully integrated passenger rail network.

2 Next steps on all four sections include  
3 continued stakeholder engagement, partner agency  
4 collaboration, and resource agency consultation. The  
5 focus of our effort is completion of revised  
6 supplemental alternative analyses documents that  
7 incorporate these items that have been discussed here  
8 today into alternatives that will be studied through  
9 the environmental process.

10 The Authority looks forward to working with  
11 partner agencies, stakeholders and communities  
12 throughout Southern California to complete this  
13 challenging work.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Miss Boehm.  
15 Questions from members?

16 Miss Perez-Estolano.

17 MS. PEREZ-ESTOLANO: I just wanted to comment  
18 to the amazing effort that the team, that Michelle and  
19 her team have done in terms of making connections with  
20 key stakeholders, city leaders and elected officials.  
21 It was something that was very sorely needed, and she  
22 has been an amazing conduit for the High-Speed Rail  
23 Authority to local folks.

24 And so as we start the process into Southern  
25 California, it's important to me to work

1 collaboratively with her, as I will be heading up the  
2 Ladies in Transit subcommittee of the board with my  
3 colleague Mr. Frank, and we look forward to working  
4 very closely on the good kind of foundation you've put  
5 in place. So thank you so much.

6 MS. BOEHM: Thank you very much. We're ready  
7 to get it done.

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Any other comments?

9 I also wanted to compliment Miss Boehm, and  
10 compliment Jeff Morales. I think we have excellent  
11 regional teams headed by first-rate people, in the  
12 Central Valley with Diana Gomez; within the north with  
13 Ben Tripousis; and here in the Southland with Michelle  
14 Boehm. And this Authority has had some challenges over  
15 the years, but I think Mr. Morales has been very, very  
16 sensitive to the need to have these kinds of community  
17 outreach efforts and do them effectively. And frankly,  
18 I think you've put a first-rate team together. And,  
19 Michelle, you are very much a part of that. So we  
20 appreciate it.

21 MS. BOEHM: Thank you very much. Thank you,  
22 Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Any other  
24 questions?

25 Actually, I would ask the CEO, my colleague

1 Tom Richards said it would be very beneficial if the  
2 board members could get copies of these maps that Miss  
3 Boehm has put up there for us today. It will give us  
4 an ongoing sense of where we're going. And I'm sure  
5 the folks in Santa Clarita would like a little dashed  
6 line of what the direct route would look like. So.

7 MS. BOEHM: I'm sure they're drawing it right  
8 now.

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. That's good. Thank  
10 you.

11 All right. Our next item is Item 4. The  
12 Award of the Regional Consultant Contracts for Merced  
13 to Sacramento and Los Angeles to San Diego.  
14 Tom Fellenz.

15 MR. FELLEENZ: Yes, Mr. Chairman and Board  
16 Members.

17 I'm here to seek a request from the staff to  
18 enter into two A&E contracts. As you just mentioned,  
19 both contracts are on Phase 2. The first one is from  
20 Merced to Sacramento. And these items have been before  
21 the Board a couple times already. If you recall, in  
22 May of 2013 we came to the Board indicating that we  
23 wanted to move on to a different contract and  
24 readvertise the work from Merced to Sacramento. That  
25 work was being undergone by AECOM; they wanted to

1 re-compete it. The Board approved this to move forward  
2 in developing an RFQ for that section. We did so and  
3 went back to the Board with the RFQ for approval in  
4 August of 2013.

5 The Board approved that part of it. We put  
6 it out for advertisement, received statements of  
7 qualification, evaluated and ranked them. And now  
8 we're in a position to award a contract after just  
9 having completed our negotiation with the  
10 best-qualified firm, Precision Civil Engineering.

11 I have also provided a write-up about  
12 Precision Civil Engineering. It's a small business, a  
13 hundred percent small-business firm located in the  
14 Central Valley. And we found them to be best  
15 qualified. And we seek your approval to enter into a  
16 contract with them for an amount up to \$1 million for a  
17 period of two years to work on continuing efforts in  
18 the Merced to Sacramento section.

19 I've also listed here some of the work that  
20 has been completed to date by AECOM so you can see  
21 what's being transitioned into, as well as an  
22 indication of what work will continue.

23 The next section, and I assume that you need  
24 to take these separately, or together, I do have two  
25 resolutions, one for each. The next section I wanted

1 to talk about was an interface from Los Angeles to San  
2 Diego. That was again taken to the board in May for an  
3 indication from staff that we wanted to move forward to  
4 readvertise that work. That work was being undergone  
5 by HNTB at the time. I have a list of tasks that HNTB  
6 had completed through September of 2013.

7 You approved our effort to move ahead in  
8 developing an RFQ, which we did so; brought it back to  
9 you in August, 2013, which you approved by resolution.  
10 And we advertised and have now identified and initiated  
11 negotiations with the best-qualified firm, which is  
12 CH2M Hill.

13 I have another write-up here on the  
14 background for CH2M Hill, a very well-established  
15 worldwide firm. They have been working on this  
16 section, that is, from Los Angeles to San Diego, since  
17 2010, and have the longest amount of -- have worked on  
18 it the longest period of time of any consultant, or  
19 actually since 2000 they've been on that section. So  
20 they are very knowledgeable about that section; will, I  
21 think, bring a lot of progress.

22 We seek to enter into a contract, an A&E  
23 contract with CH2M Hill for up to \$2 million over the  
24 period two years for that work on that Los Angeles to  
25 San Diego section.

1 I'm here to answer any questions you might  
2 have. Again, I have two board resolutions, and I would  
3 advise that you vote on them separately. The first one  
4 is 13-27. The second one is 13-28.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right. Thank you,  
6 Mr. Fellenz.

7 Questions from Members of the Board?

8 It was good continuity in the presentation  
9 last time with us.

10 Miss Schenk.

11 MS. SCHENK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12 Tom, I just have one question. On the HNTB  
13 contract, was everything completed that we required of  
14 them under that contract?

15 MR. FELLEENZ: Yes, it was. Yes, it was. And  
16 now we're transitioning into a new contract. The work  
17 that they did will be taken up by the new firm, CH2M  
18 Hill, if you choose to approve this.

19 MS. SCHENK: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right. Pleasure of  
21 the Board?

22 MR. HARTNETT: Mr. Chairman, I move adoption  
23 of Resolution 13-27.

24 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right.

25 MR. HENNING: Second.

1                   CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Moved by Vice-Chair  
2 Hartnett, seconded by Miss Schenk and by Mr. Henning.

3                   Could the Secretary please call the roll?

4                   MS. NIEBEL: Vice-Chair Richards.

5                   MR. RICHARDS: Yes.

6                   MS. NIEBEL: Vice-Chair Hartnett.

7                   MR. HARTNETT: Yes.

8                   MS. NIEBEL: Mr. Umberg.

9                   MR. UMBERG: Yes.

10                  MS. NIEBEL: Mr. Rossi.

11                  MR. ROSSI: Yes.

12                  MS. NIEBEL: Miss Schenk.

13                  MS. SCHENK: Yes.

14                  MS. NIEBEL: Miss Perez-Estolano.

15                  MS. PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Yes.

16                  MS. NIEBEL: Mr. Henning.

17                  MR. HENNING: Yes.

18                  MS. NIEBEL: Chairman Richard.

19                  CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes.

20                  Is there a motion on the next resolution?

21                  MR. HARTNETT: I move we adopt Resolution  
22 13-28.

23                  MS. SCHENK: Second.

24                  CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Hartnett. Seconded  
25 by Ms. Schenk.

1                   Please call the roll.

2                   MS. NIEBEL: Vice-Chair Richards.

3                   MR. RICHARDS: Yes.

4                   MS. NIEBEL: Vice-Chair Hartnett.

5                   MR. HARTNETT: Yes.

6                   MS. NIEBEL: Mr. Umberg.

7                   MR. UMBERG: Yes.

8                   MS. NIEBEL: Mr. Rossi.

9                   MR. ROSSI: Yes.

10                  MS. NIEBEL: Miss Schenk.

11                  MS. SCHENK: Yes.

12                  MS. NIEBEL: Miss Perez-Estolano.

13                  MS. PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Yes.

14                  MS. NIEBEL: Mr. Henning.

15                  MR. HENNING: Yes.

16                  MS. NIEBEL: Chairman Richard.

17                  CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes.

18                  All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Fellenz.

19                  We have one item left on our agenda. I,

20                  unfortunately, need to leave for a function with

21                  representatives from out of the country on High-Speed

22                  Rail business, and so I'm going to ask Vice-Chair

23                  Richards to preside over this last item.

24                  And I want to thank Mr. Fellenz and his staff

25                  for preparing materials for today.

1           And I thought I saw Art Leahy, the legendary  
2 leader of the MTA, stick his head in. And we certainly  
3 wanted to welcome him, say hi.

4           Yes. Okay. So with that, I will turn it  
5 over to Vice-Chair Richards. But I do want to say that  
6 I'm sorry I'm not here for this presentation because I  
7 think that opening up and allowing for unsolicited  
8 proposals to come before us to help address many things  
9 that we saw in Miss Boehm's presentation and other  
10 things on the system can be a very exciting prospect,  
11 so we need to do that as well.

12           With that, thank you all very much.

13           VICE-CHAIR RICHARDS: Item Number 6, the  
14 adoption of a policy for unsolicited proposals.  
15 Mr. Fellenz.

16           MR. FELLEENZ: Yes, Vice-Chair Richards and  
17 Board Members.

18           As you've heard from a couple of the public  
19 comments, there is interest in submitting unsolicited  
20 proposals to the Authority, and we have been receiving  
21 some of those. So what we recognize is that we need a  
22 formal policy and a process to intake these proposals,  
23 evaluate them, and decide whether they should lead to a  
24 procurement.

25           And so what we've done here in the memo and

1 written policy is kind of laid out the process that we  
2 went through in order to decide how to proceed.

3 We have looked at other transportation  
4 authorities throughout the country and also in  
5 California. CalTrans has a draft unsolicited proposal  
6 policy at this time, as well as Departments of  
7 Transportation in Virginia, Arizona, Nevada, Texas,  
8 Pennsylvania, Florida and Colorado.

9 In addition to that, federal government  
10 allows unsolicited proposals. So we've seen a range of  
11 activity by Departments of Transportation looking at  
12 receiving and considering these types of proposals.

13 We also listed from these Departments of  
14 Transportation some success stories, and that is that  
15 they have received proposals and have actually taken  
16 them to fruition; that is, to a project that was  
17 completed. And they were done under budgets, with  
18 private monies. And I think this will be a real  
19 benefit to our system, because we could benefit from  
20 new ideas and from private money, which is allowed  
21 under our statutory scheme.

22 So we put together for your consideration a  
23 policy, and just a basic outline of the process which  
24 will develop more fully. The idea is that we would  
25 receive these unsolicited proposals, as we still do,

1 and we would ask the proposers to give us a  
2 nonrefundable fee. The purpose of the fee is to pay  
3 for the internal costs of doing the evaluation and to  
4 determine whether we should move ahead, whether it's an  
5 idea that is compliant, consistent with our policies  
6 and direction.

7 And then, we have an initial intake and then  
8 we will do two levels of screening. The first  
9 screening would be a very high-level screening to see  
10 and make sure that the project is something that could  
11 be done within the scope, feasibility, complexity,  
12 financial, and relevance to our program.

13 And then if we believe there is merit to it,  
14 and this would be done by a steering committee that has  
15 areas of expertise from the various sections within our  
16 High-Speed Rail program, and these would be state  
17 employees with the assistance from consultant staff as  
18 needed; we would do a more high-level screening to  
19 decide whether, again, it would be worth moving ahead  
20 with the proposal.

21 If the proposal had merit and we believed it  
22 should be advertised for a competitive process, then  
23 this steering committee would approach executive  
24 management and give them various areas of expertise,  
25 and the executive management would make a decision as

1 to whether to move forward or not.

2 If the decision was made to go forward on the  
3 unsolicited proposal, then we would turn it into a  
4 competitive procurement process, so there wouldn't be a  
5 sole source to this firm or person that came up with  
6 the idea; that they would be allowed to compete as  
7 everyone would.

8 And we would develop it into a competition.  
9 We would not write a proposal around one product, but  
10 would open it up to any other products or processes  
11 that would lead to the same type of procurement.

12 We think that we put together a policy that  
13 deals with this process and would allow us to now take  
14 in some of these ideas and really seriously consider  
15 them within the framework of this policy.

16 And we have some more work to do though. We  
17 have some procedures to work out at the staff level in  
18 order to flesh out all the details that would be  
19 necessary for this process to take place; for example,  
20 we would have to decide who would be members of the  
21 steering committee, how they would function, what type  
22 of documents they would produce for consideration by  
23 the executive management team in order to consider this  
24 proposal.

25 So I'm here to answer any questions. We're

1 asking the board to authorize Jeff Morales our CEO, or  
2 his designee, to sign and disseminate this unsolicited  
3 proposal policy that we have here before you and to  
4 allow the development of procedures so we can evaluate  
5 these procedures and then in a timely manner follow the  
6 framework within the policy that we've laid out here.

7 VICE-CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you, Mr. Fellenz.  
8 Before I ask, are there any questions from my  
9 colleagues of Mr. Fellenz?

10 MR. MORALES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11 I think private participation has always been  
12 a key element of this program from the outset. And  
13 what this does is open up the process to allow for the  
14 private sector to not only respond to solicitations  
15 from us, but to in fact initiate proposals, and really  
16 let the Authority, let the State, let the public be the  
17 beneficiaries of the creative thinking that can come  
18 out of the private sector.

19 So this really builds on what has been a  
20 central tack of this program from the beginning. I  
21 think it's appropriate we're presenting this here in  
22 Los Angeles because certainly L.A. Metro has been a  
23 leader on a regional level in encouraging this sort of  
24 idea and thinking, so I think it dovetails with what's  
25 been done in this region and what they've demonstrated

1 can be done.

2 VICE-CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you, Mr. Morales.  
3 Any questions or comments from Members of the  
4 Board? Miss Schenk?

5 MS. SCHENK: Thank you.

6 I just wanted to comment that in the  
7 individual briefings, the concerns were raised about  
8 this process not being a vehicle to serve and run the  
9 RFP process. And I appreciate the thoroughness with  
10 which you have responded to that and have outlined that  
11 this is really a vehicle to get some good ideas and  
12 then put it into the ordinary course of business the  
13 way we deal with RFPs. So thank you for that.

14 VICE-CHAIR RICHARDS: All right. Thank you.  
15 Mr. Hartnett, Vice-Chair Hartnett?

16 MR. HARTNETT: Yes, thank you.

17 Both for Theo and general counsel, there were  
18 comments during the public comment session in which the  
19 Chair asked the commentators to put their ideas in  
20 writing. I interpreted their comments to be in line  
21 with procedural issues rather than policy issues. And  
22 I want to see if that's your take on those comments as  
23 well.

24 And secondly, if we adopt the policy today,  
25 at what point in time would the procedures be prepared

1 and finalized? And what would be the relationship  
2 between the timing of the preparation of the procedures  
3 and the distribution of the policy?

4 MR. MORALES: I think I got those three  
5 questions.

6 In terms of the comments, yes, I believe that  
7 that was a -- they're looking for clarification of how  
8 the process would actually work. We've had significant  
9 input from various private interests about having such  
10 a policy in place.

11 One of the problems we have today is in the  
12 absence of a policy, we have no way of considering a  
13 proposal coming in, an unsolicited proposal. So again,  
14 the idea here is to set up that process.

15 The policy, if approved today, would take  
16 effect essentially immediately, I believe, Tom, and  
17 then we would go about the process of setting up the  
18 specific rules of the program and publish those  
19 separately. But by adopting the policy, if the board  
20 does that, the signal would be sent out to the private  
21 sector that this process is getting underway; that  
22 those who do have ideas that they want to share with us  
23 and potentially propose, now start the process of  
24 developing them further for our consideration. And we  
25 would look to move on in developing those rules

1 quickly, certainly within the next, I would say, 45, 60  
2 days or so.

3 VICE-CHAIR RICHARDS: Miss Perez-Estolano.

4 MS. PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Thank you, Chair.

5 I just wanted to bring up a little bit of the  
6 history on this particular proposal. We, actually it  
7 was brought to the board earlier this summer, and I  
8 felt that we needed and I asked my colleagues to give  
9 us some more time to have a fuller report, frankly,  
10 given to the board.

11 And I appreciate the effort that the team has  
12 made, Tom, to really address the issues. You've looked  
13 at other case studies, you've studied other states,  
14 other agencies to really bring to the board an example,  
15 and to the public, how the best kind of case studies  
16 are available out there and how we really try to cherry  
17 pick the best parts of it.

18 The concern that I had, and I feel better  
19 about, is the transparency issue, because a lot of  
20 ideas are coming to us. And one of the things that I  
21 appreciate my colleague Mike Rossi mentioned is we  
22 don't want to stiffen any creative, innovative ideas  
23 that the private sector or anyone else has to bring  
24 into this project. Other agencies have benefited  
25 tremendously from ideas, from innovative folks out

1 there. And so the transparency is very important to  
2 me.

3 I also -- so I appreciate the process that  
4 we're going to go through to kind of, as my colleague  
5 said, make sure that there's the intake, the screening,  
6 that all of that stays open.

7 One of the things that we mentioned in our  
8 check-in call with the board members, and I appreciate  
9 you doing that, is there is some peer review. And I  
10 think maybe, Lynn, you had mentioned that, that there  
11 is some way that we actually create some kind of peer  
12 review, an independent audit. I'm not sure where that  
13 would happen, but I just want to make sure that that's  
14 something that we think about as we go through, at the  
15 board level, say the policy is in place, but the then  
16 application is refined.

17 So that's just one thing.

18 MR. FELLEENZ: we'll look into that, yes.

19 MS. PEREZ-ESTOLANO: And then the second  
20 thing, as we've heard echoed time and time again, is  
21 how do we assure that the small businesses have access  
22 to this process, too. There's a high threshold for  
23 acceptance of ideas in terms of us being able to review  
24 those policies, proposals. I want to make sure that we  
25 have access to small businesses or kind of consortiums

1 of small businesses, that we allow those ideas to come  
2 from all different levels of the private sector.

3 MR. FELLEENZ: There's no restriction as to  
4 who can submit these proposals. So certainly any  
5 business, small, large, could submit the proposal  
6 itself, and then when we go through the procurement  
7 process, we again will have our 30 percent small  
8 business goal in that procurement itself.

9 MS. PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Correct. Isn't there a  
10 fee if we accept the proposal?

11 MR. FELLEENZ: There is a fee for us to do the  
12 evaluation of the proposal, yes. We haven't set those  
13 dollar figures yet. That's internally what we're  
14 looking at. We'll consider that in the process.

15 MS. PEREZ-ESTOLANO: That's what I would ask,  
16 is that we consider the opportunity for small  
17 businesses to be able to participate in this process.

18 MR. FELLEENZ: Okay.

19 MS. PEREZ-ESTOLANO: I think those are the  
20 only things that I had. But thank you very much for  
21 following up, again the hard work that you all did to  
22 give us the material to make a good decision.

23 VICE-CHAIR RICHARDS: Thanks.

24 Any other questions or comments?

25 Seeing none, do we have a motion for approval

1 of Resolution HSRA 13-29?

2 MS. PEREZ-ESTOLANO: I'll move approval.

3 VICE-CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you, Miss Perez.  
4 Mr. Henning seconded.

5 Please call the roll.

6 MS. NIEBEL: Vice-Chair Richards.

7 VICE-CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes.

8 MS. NIEBEL: Vice-Chair Hartnett.

9 MR. HARTNETT: Yes.

10 MS. NIEBEL: Mr. Umberg.

11 Mr. Rossi.

12 Miss Schenk.

13 MS. SCHENK: Yes.

14 MS. NIEBEL: Miss Perez-Estolano.

15 MS. PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Yes.

16 MS. NIEBEL: Mr. Henning.

17 MR. HENNING: Yes.

18 VICE-CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you. Motion  
19 carries.

20 We have no further business today, Ladies and  
21 Gentlemen. Thank you for being here. The meeting of  
22 the High-Speed Rail Authority is adjourned.

23 (Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 12:25 p.m.)  
24  
25

