

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

CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY
EIR/EIS PUBLIC COMMENTS HEARING

SAN FRANCISCO CITY HALL, BOARD CHAMBERS
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, AUGUST 23, 2007 - 4:00 O'CLOCK P.M.

---o0o---

REPORTED BY: DEBORAH FUQUA, CSR#12948

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

A P P E A R A N C E S

HON. QUENTIN KOPP

Chairman of the Board

California High-Speed Rail Authority

(Moderator)

DAVID WELLENSTEIN

Federal Railroad Administration

MEHDI MORSHED

Executive Director

California High-Speed Rail Authority

CARRIE POURVAHIDI

Deputy Director

California High-Speed Rail Authority

DAN LEAVITT

Deputy Director

California High-Speed Rail Authority

CHRISTINE SPROUL

Deputy Attorney General

State of California Department of Justice

P U B L I C S P E A K E R S

PSSF 1	3	Jake McGoldrick	Charlie Cameron	PSSF 14
PSSF 2	4	Bob Beck	Kurt Evans	PSSF 15
PSSF 3	5	Vice Mayor James Janz	Jennifer Johnson	PSSF 16
PSSF 4	6	Jim Bigelow	Jim Lazarus	PSSF 17
PSSF 5	7	Andrea Nieves	Gwynn MacKellen	PSSF 18
PSSF 6	8	Michael Rubio	Jane Morrison	PSSF 19
PSSF 7	9	Michael Sydnor	Margaret Okuzuni	PSSF 20
PSSF 8	10	David Schonbrunn	Mayor Gavin Newsom	PSSF 21
PSSF 9	11	Christian Riviera	Yu Hanacura	PSSF 22
PSSF 10	12	Jerry Vail	John Diamante	PSSF 23
PSSF 11	13	Dale Champion	Will Spargur	PSSF 24
PSSF 12	14	James Haas	Richard Mlynarick	PSSF 25
PSSF 13	15	Michael Mahoney	Colette Crutcher	PSSF 26

---o0o---

1 Thursday, August 23, 2007

4:15 o'clock p.m.

2 ---o0o---

3 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Good afternoon, ladies and
4 gentlemen. Welcome to this first of at least six public
5 hearings conducted for the purposes of receiving -- and
6 I underscore the word "receiving" -- comments from the
7 public about the document entitled "Draft Bay Area to
8 Central Valley High-Speed Train Program Environmental
9 Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement," EIR/EIS,
10 a summary of which is contained in the document I hold
11 in my hand and, of course, is available to all
12 interested parties.

13 This is a public hearing that is conducted for
14 the purpose just stated. It is not conducted for
15 purposes of generating a discussion or debate between
16 members of the California High-Speed Rail Authority
17 Board of Directors, of which I am one -- which reminds
18 me, I should introduce myself.

19 I am Judge Quentin Kopp, who also serves as
20 chairman of the California High-Speed Rail Authority
21 which, in turn, is composed of eight other members from
22 San Diego to Petaluma. And I expect that at least one
23 other member will join us before today's session
24 concludes. We're scheduled from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m.

25 This public hearing and the subsequent public

1 hearings is held under the joint sponsorship of the
2 Authority itself and Federal Railroad Administration,
3 represented today by David Wellenstein, who is the
4 environmental project manager in the Office of Railroad
5 Development.

6 And David, if you could raise your hand.

7 To my immediate left is Mehdi Morshed, who has
8 been for ten years or more the executive director of the
9 Authority itself. And sitting directly across from me
10 is a deputy director of the Authority, Carrie
11 Pourvahidi.

12 If you will raise your hand, please.

13 Also seated on that side of the room is
14 Christine Sproul, Deputy Attorney General with the
15 Department of Justice of the State of California. And
16 next to her is Mr. Dan Leavitt, who is the other deputy
17 director of the Authority.

18 Dan, if you'll raise your hand.

19 And I'd like to ask Rosemary Mejia to raise her
20 hand because she is kind of a timekeeper. I have
21 received -- oh, I don't know -- about 12 or so cards of
22 people who wish to speak. I don't propose, per se, to
23 put a limit on people speaking unless time demands that
24 a limit be imposed, but please remember that we'd
25 appreciate it if you would avoid repetition of a point

1 or an issue or some material or matter that you believe
2 the EIR/EIS doesn't discuss adequately or discusses
3 incorrectly, as the case may be.

4 There is a court reporter who is recording and
5 will report by a written transcript all of the
6 utterances here this afternoon.

7 And I will also add that tomorrow we will hold
8 a public hearing in San Jose -- all of the public
9 hearings from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. That will be at the San
10 Jose City Hall. And then next Monday, Tuesday,
11 Wednesday, Thursday, we'll be in Livermore, Oakland, and
12 Gilroy. We wind up, as I recall, in Merced.

13 For those who are interested in the idea that,
14 well, it would be good to have some more public hearings
15 in the Central Valley, I can report that we intend to do
16 that, but probably not until the middle of September and
17 in Stockton, time and place to be announced after we
18 solidify the arrangements.

19 So I will begin the order of people who wish to
20 address us.

21 I start with Supervisor Jake McGoldrick of San
22 Francisco, who is a member of the San Francisco Board of
23 Supervisors, and he is chairman of the San Francisco
24 Transportation Authority.

25 Mr. McGoldrick.

1 JAKE MCGOLDRICK: Thank you very much, Judge Kopp.
2 And certainly welcome back.

3 We hope you find, all of you, the seats very
4 comfortable. They are, as Judge Kopp knows, seats that
5 many of us occupy very temporarily while we all pursue
6 permanent issues. And this is a permanent issue, one
7 that, as chair of the Transportation Authority, we have
8 taken a great deal of interest and a great deal of
9 leadership in promoting.

10 I think it's very important that, as we go
11 forth, we note, for example, that earlier this afternoon
12 our mayor, Mayor Newsom, and Judge Kopp did hold a press
13 conference in which the public was able to ascertain
14 that there are some important features of High-Speed
15 Rail which inevitably lead to a decision which we hope
16 will bring High-Speed Rail to San Francisco. The
17 necessity of a high-speed rail system in California is
18 so obvious that it seems like we'd be preaching to the
19 choir if we went on for too long. And certainly, as
20 Judge Kopp knows, anybody who is in the public realm for
21 many years obtains the name "Verbosity" as their middle
22 name. And I will cheat cheap to be as succinct and as
23 minimalist as possible here today because you will hear
24 from our mayor at 4:30. Our mayor is expected to come
25 here.

PSSF1-1
Cont.

1 Again, besides welcoming you, the High-Speed
2 Rail and the Federal Rail Administration here, I'd like
3 to thank you for all the important work that you are
4 doing on behalf of the State of California. Again, we
5 agree with the High-Speed Rail Authority because we have
6 been, again, at the forefront here in San Francisco
7 developing that vision for the past decade and a half.

8 Again, thank you for the comment on the
9 environmental documents for High-Speed Rail Plan, and we
10 want to be able to anticipate that we will be submitting
11 more detailed comments on behalf of the San Francisco
12 County Transportation Authority, which also co-functions
13 as the San Francisco Congestion Management Agency, as
14 you may know.

15 We want to be sure to point out two basic
16 issues today, just two basic issues. I'll be short and
17 allow the public to come forward as soon as possible.

PSSF1-2

18 Number one, we know that the Authority is
19 looking at some alignment alternatives that do not
20 terminate in San Francisco, does not terminate in San
21 Francisco. And we simply don't believe that you can
22 have an effective high-speed rail system in California
23 without San Francisco as one of the main terminals. We
24 understand that. And that's why the voters of San
25 Francisco, by 75 percent majority -- huge, 75 percent

PSSF1-2
Cont.

1 majority -- elected to tax themselves back in 2003,
2 continuing tradition that had gone back on another
3 proposition that had created a half-cent sales tax.

4 That sales tax which we imposed upon ourselves
5 puts \$270 million, \$270 million, just local
6 transportation tax sales [sic] money into the CalTrain
7 Downtown Extension and what's also known as the Transbay
8 Transit Center project. And it's precisely for the
9 purpose of ensuring that we will have a world-class
10 high-speed rail terminal in San Francisco at that
11 terminal and that it will be, indeed, a terminal that
12 transforms San Francisco and the entire California
13 transit picture.

PSSF1-3

14 Secondly, it's very essential that the
15 Authority keep in mind that, at all times, High-Speed
16 Rail is a visionary initiative intended to solve,
17 really, the big problems of the state. So we're not
18 just San Francisco-centric. We see -- and the mayor,
19 again, will give you more details than I think is proper
20 for me to give you today. But in terms of social, in
21 terms of economics, in terms of environmental -- the
22 list of benefits is so large for the state in terms of
23 issues that -- certainly I believe -- Republicans have
24 been calling "new urbanism," Democrats have called
25 "smart growth" -- we will be bipartisan. We will even

1 invite the Green Party. We must all work together and
2 be tripartisan, that we are all in this together. And
3 that we are in the situation where we understand that
4 the benefits are huge for the state of California.

5 Again, I'll leave the details for the mayor.
6 But you know what the population growth and the
7 demographics are for the next 30 years, for the next 40
8 years and so on, and the job growth issues and what
9 we'll see there and how we need to address that, both
10 for commercial and for the residential uses.

11 This includes, of course, a lot of pressure on
12 the airports: the airport runway capacity, the issue of
13 climate change -- imperative that it's there on the
14 climate-change issue. And those will be addressed by
15 connecting the main urban centers so that people can
16 take advantage of rail travel instead of flying.

17 And we know we've got to go there. We all know
18 we've got to go there. So many other places in the
19 world go there.

20 It would be a mistake to take the alignment to
21 serve suburbs and go with that when the expectation is
22 that we can solve suburban gridlock with High-Speed
23 Rail. I believe that what we have to do is make the
24 kind of junctures that are obvious in terms of the urban
25 junctures.

1 And again, we will stand ready, we are ready to
2 continue our advocacy for High-Speed Rail and assert the
3 authority in whatever way, in whichever way we can and
4 make sure that High-Speed Rail is a reality for
5 California sooner rather than later, in the next few
6 years rather than way out beyond there.

7 I will be a grandfather in the next few months.
8 And I would very much like to bounce little Jake on my
9 knee on a high-speed ride down to Southern California as
10 soon as possible.

11 Thank you, very much.

12 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you,
13 Mr. Supervisor.

14 I should also remind people, because
15 Mr. McGoldrick, I think, mentioned it at least
16 elliptically, we invite written comments on the EIR/EIS
17 analysis. And those must be submitted to us by
18 September 28th. September 28th.

19 Next speaker is Bob Beck of the Transbay Joint
20 Powers Authority.

21 Mr. Beck.

22 I say "speaker" -- witness, whatever.

PSSF2-1 | 23 BOB BECK: Thank you. Again, Bob Beck with the
24 Transbay Joint Powers Authority.

25 And I'd like to congratulate High-Speed Rail

PSSF2-1
Cont.

1 Authority on reaching this milestone with this draft
2 environmental document and express our excitement at the
3 budget being finalized this week including funding that
4 will allow you to continue this important work -- and
5 our full support for High-Speed Rail in California.

PSSF2-2

6 The TJPA looks forward to continuing work to
7 bring High-Speed Rail to the Bay Area and would like to
8 speak to the advantages of the Transbay Transit Center
9 as a destination for High-Speed Rail in San Francisco.

10 Since San Francisco voters approved Prop H in
11 1999 to rebuild the Transbay Transit Center, extend the
12 CalTrain, and make provisions for High-Speed Rail
13 service into the transit center, the transit center has
14 played an integral part in the regional rail planning
15 for the future of rail service in Northern California.

16 Regional Measure 2 in 2003 echoed Prop H's call
17 to extend rail service, including potential high-speed
18 rail service into the Transbay Transit Center. And we
19 look forward to November of 2008 when, hopefully,
20 statewide voters will, again, have the opportunity to
21 make their statement on this important project.

22 The TJPA has taken great strides in advancing
23 engineering work on our project and the CalTrain
24 extension and ensuring that that work will be compatible
25 with High-Speed Rail service.

1 I'd like to say a few words in support of the
2 Transit Center as a San Francisco destination. As the
3 draft document points out, the Transit Center will
4 maximize ridership and revenue on the San Francisco
5 destination. It has supreme connectivity and
6 accessibility with walking distance to the Financial
7 District. It will be in the heart of the Transbay
8 Redevelopment Area, which will be the highest-density
9 residential neighborhood in San Francisco. And it's
10 endorsed by MTC Resolution 3434. It maximizes
11 compatibility with existing and planned development and
12 reduces traffic congestion.

13 In short, the Transbay Transit Center optimizes
14 High-Speed Rail connectivity and convenience to the Bay
15 Area, and we look forward to providing a regional hub
16 for the 21st century.

17 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you, Mr. Beck.

18 The Honorable James Janz, member of the Town
19 Council, Town of Atherton.

20 VICE MAYOR JAMES JANZ: Thank you, your Honor.

21 I'm James Janz, Vice Mayor of the Town of
22 Atherton. Thank you for the opportunity to address this
23 issue.

24 I'm going to try to be as brief and to the
25 point as I can. I would like to see what's described as

1 the I-280 alignment reinstated as an alternative to the
2 CalTrain corridor for the connection between San Jose
3 and San Francisco. All of the reasons that were given
4 in the two-paragraph rejection of the 280 alignment as
5 being difficulties -- cost of any possible right-of-way
6 acquisition, construction impact, the need for
7 additional right-of-way, et cetera -- are all true in
8 spades in the CalTrain corridor.

9 In addition, there's another reason why I think
10 it's important that that be looked at. The proposal for
11 using CalTrain as a corridor to connect San Jose and San
12 Francisco had included in it the notion that the
13 High-Speed Rail would make a stop on the Peninsula.
14 Redwood City and Palo Alto were discussed as likely
15 places for that.

16 But it turns out that that train is -- that
17 there are actually two high-speed rails. There's an
18 express high-speed rail, and there's a not-so-express
19 high-speed rail. The express high-speed rail would go
20 from San Francisco to San Jose and then a minimum number
21 of stops from there down to Los Angeles. The
22 not-so-express high-speed rail would be one that would
23 go from San Francisco, stop on the Peninsula, stop in
24 San Jose, and then make several more stops before it
25 gets to Los Angeles.

1 So it means that anyone wanting to go from the
2 Peninsula to Los Angeles would have to either drive or
3 take CalTrain to Redwood City or Palo Alto, there get on
4 the not-so-express high-speed train, go to San Jose, get
5 off, and get on the express high-speed train to continue
6 their journey down to Los Angeles.

7 Rather than do that, why don't we just use the
8 facility we already have? We already have CalTrain. We
9 already have Baby Bullets. The person can go to the
10 nearest CalTrain station, take it into San Francisco or
11 San Jose, whichever is most convenient for them, get on
12 the real high-speed rail, the express high-speed rail
13 train, and go directly to Los Angeles with a minimal
14 number of stops. I think that would be the best way to
15 do it.

16 And I also think that the 280 alignment would
17 make a much more pleasant ride, at least for that part
18 of the journey, for the rider. Riding along the
19 CalTrain corridor -- and I know it well because I ride
20 it every day -- you see mostly the backs of buildings.

21 On the other hand, if you were riding on
22 High-Speed Rail along the 280 corridor, from the Diridon
23 Station, it's two short blocks along the CalTrain
24 corridor to I-280, and from there you can follow the
25 I-280 corridor all the way up to the 380, turn east at

PSSF3-1
Cont.

1 380 and follow the 380 corridor and rejoin the CalTrain
2 line with either a stop or a spur off to the airport and
3 continue on into San Francisco.

4 The experience for the rider, as you know, most
5 likely from driving along 280, it's practically like
6 flying. You're trying to compete with the airplane and
7 get people out of their cars and out of the airplanes
8 and onto the train; give them an experience that's
9 worthwhile.

10 Thank you.

11 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you very much,
12 Mr. Councilman.

13 Let me note the arrival of Commissioner Ron
14 Diridon from San Jose and a ten-year member of the
15 Authority.

16 COMMISSIONER RON DIRIDON: I'll blame your baseball
17 team on my tardiness.

18 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you.

19 Next person is Jim Bigelow, Redwood City
20 Chamber of Commerce.

PSSF4-1

21 JIM BIGELOW: Good afternoon. The Redwood City San
22 Mateo County chambers have been following this process
23 for a long time. And I would like to alert the Board,
24 as far as the EIS and EIR study goes, that the City of
25 Redwood City adopted a new Precise Plan very, very

PSSF4-1
Cont.

1 recently that puts 2500 housing units around the Redwood
2 City CalTrain Station area. It has mixed use, has a lot
3 of walk-through.

4 And a picture of that proposed station is
5 actually in your EIR/EIS document. So the City of
6 Redwood City has come forward with a -- trying to
7 accommodate high-speed rail on the Peninsula corridor.
8 Whether the train comes by Dumbarton, Altamont, or it
9 comes up through Pacheco, it's still going to come
10 through Redwood City.

PSSF4-2

11 Our chamber has supported the CalTrain 2025
12 Plan. And that plan includes operations with the
13 California High-Speed Rail. And CalTrain, the Joint
14 Powers Board, has made applications of FRA. And they're
15 processing a request to change the type of equipment on
16 the main line to a lighter rail, electric motorized
17 unit, EMU-type technology, with a positive control
18 system that seems to be being received well in
19 Washington, and it takes about a two-year period to
20 develop a new standard.

21 The same power system and compatibility for the
22 new CalTrain EMU's, if that standard can be achieved,
23 both High-Speed Rail and the new CalTrain equipment
24 could operate compatibly in the corridor.

PSSF4-3

25 So we would encourage you to keep on with your

1 work and keep moving the project forward. I would
2 suggest in your document that it might -- when you look
3 at air traffic congestion at the airport, San Francisco,
4 L.A., and the like, there's delays, flight delays. And
5 one of the ideas, when you're expanding the airports
6 because of limitations on the runways that can be added
7 -- and capacity -- that some of the shorter-haul flights
8 could be accommodated on High-Speed Rail. Employees
9 could commute to Southern California for a meeting for
10 the day and back.

11 And I think maybe in the economic plan, it
12 might help out the understanding that, not only would
13 this help people for personal transportation, but for
14 the business traveler, they could work and be on this
15 train. And it also could deal with some of the short
16 commute hauls in the San Joaquin.

17 And if San Francisco has a low ceiling, they
18 have to go into single file. And flights back up all
19 across the country. So High-Speed Rail could -- in your
20 report, I think, with a little more explanation, I think
21 that could be helpful for the Los Angeles connection and
22 so forth.

23 So we look forward to you moving forward and
24 deciding the issue of the alignment. And I'll speak at
25 another hearing on that.

1 Thank you.

2 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you, very much, Jim.
3 Andrea Nieves, Greenlining Institute.

PSSF5-1

4 ANDREA NIEVES: Good afternoon. May it please the
5 Authority, my name is Andrea Nieves, and I'm a research
6 analyst at the Greenlining Institute, a public policy
7 organization that advocates on behalf of minority and
8 low- and moderate-income Californians.

9 The Greenlining Institute firmly believes that
10 High-Speed Rail does not serve the interests of low- and
11 moderate-income Californians. The project does not
12 represent a substantial improvement over current
13 transportation options, given the high price tag. It
14 will also benefit only a very small portion of
15 Californians, yet everyone's tax dollars will go towards
16 financing the project.

PSSF5-2

17 One of the most serious concerns about the
18 project is the cost. The current official price tag is
19 \$40 billion. But studies show that similar large-scale
20 public works projects generally run up to seven times
21 the initial estimate. For example, engineers originally
22 projected the English Channel to cost \$6.2 billion, but
23 the project ended up costing over 15 billion. Boston's
24 Big Dig started out at \$2.5 billion costs, and costs are
25 now up to 13.6 billion. Even the cost of retrofitting

PSSF5-2
Cont.

1 the Bay Bridge has increased 5 percent.

2 In light of these examples and numerous others,
3 we say with full confidence this project will ultimately
4 cost \$100 billion. So the question we must ask
5 ourselves first is how best to spend those \$100 billion.

PSSF5-3

6 For this, we should consider first who our
7 primary beneficiaries would be. We can do this by a
8 process of elimination. Let's see who will not benefit
9 from the High-Speed Rail. A comprehensive study by
10 U.C. Berkeley's Boalt School of Law concluded that the
11 High-Speed Rail Project does not represent a substantial
12 improvement over the two prevailing modes of intercity
13 transport in California today: air travel and driving.

14 The High-Speed Rail Authority's own figures
15 estimate that the door-to-door time savings of taking
16 the train versus taking an airplane range from 6 to 30
17 minutes. The Authority also put the projected cost of
18 the train tickets at a range of 47 to \$59, depending on
19 the routes. A quick search on any of the lost-cost
20 airline ticket Web sites will show that airlines are
21 fully capable of meeting or beating the train's prices.
22 So neither time nor cost consideration seems to provide
23 an impetus for air travelers to switch to rail.

24 How about driving? Driving is clearly cheaper
25 when traveling with a group. And if the cost of taking

PSSF5-3
Cont.

1 the train will be comparable to the cost of flying, then
2 the same people who currently choose to drive rather
3 than fly will continue to drive.

4 There is one major advantage that High-Speed
5 Rail can potentially have on both air and road travel:
6 environmental friendliness. But environmental
7 protection as the main argument for spending \$100
8 billion on High-Speed Rail is clearly off the mark
9 because we have just proven that High-Speed Rail will
10 not provide a substantial pull-away from existing
11 high-polluting forms of transportation. Driving and
12 flying will continue to increase despite the High-Speed
13 Rail.

PSSF5-4

14 So who does this leave in the potential
15 passenger pool for the High-Speed Rail service? In
16 short, the people who will benefit are those who already
17 have ample choices for mobility: the wealthy. Where
18 does that leave the rest of California? The vast
19 majority of people in our metropolitan areas live in
20 suburbs, virtually unconnected by public transit and who
21 use private cars as their primary mode of
22 transportation. This includes lower and moderate-income
23 people who have little or no demand for high-speed
24 intercity transportation.

25 This summer's rail ridership and revenue

PSSF5-4
Cont.

1 forecasting final report does little to ensure that the
2 70 percent of Americans who live from paycheck to
3 paycheck will have an incentive to utilize the
4 High-Speed Rail system, in particular, members of
5 communities of color.

6 And finally, even if you ignore all the data
7 regarding the lack of feasibility on this high-cost
8 project, the budget the Senate passed yesterday
9 demonstrates a lack of legislative commitment to public
10 transit. Without State assistance for existing local
11 transit systems, it is preposterous to think that the
12 State of California can afford a costly high-speed rail
13 system at this time.

14 Thank you.

15 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you.

16 Supervisor Michael Rubio of the County of Kern,
17 who is also the chairman of San Joaquin Valley Council
18 of Governments.

19 Good afternoon, Supervisor.

20 MICHAEL RUBIO: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman,
21 Mr. Morshed. It's a pleasure to see you again.

22 Although I am a member of the Board of
23 Supervisors in the County of Kern, today I stand before
24 you as a representative of the entire San Joaquin Valley
25 in one of the unique times where everyone in the valley

PSSF6-1

1 comes together in consensus on one item; it is the
2 High-Speed Rail. It is probably the single most
3 important factor that we'll have for our economy
4 throughout the San Joaquin Valley.

5 And I intend to be before your body throughout
6 the next several days as you continue to hold meetings
7 in the northern part of California and in the San
8 Joaquin Valley. And each time I am before you, I will
9 have a theme.

10 Today's theme is that the San Joaquin Valley,
11 simply put, makes the High-Speed Rail work. There's
12 going to be a lot of discussion today about what's the
13 important location for the San Francisco area; tomorrow
14 will be the San Jose area. And I'm here to tell you
15 that, when you look at the forecasting studies that you
16 have presented as early as March, the first- and the
17 third-largest share of ridership is simply in the San
18 Joaquin Valley and then up the valley to the L.A. and
19 San Francisco area.

20 So I would argue that, without the San Joaquin
21 Valley, High-Speed Rail will not exist. And as such, I
22 think, when you start moving and prioritizing and
23 establishing and constructing this very important mode
24 of transportation, you look first to the San Joaquin
25 Valley. We will be speaking as one on this particular

1 issue. That means the region from the Grapevine, which
2 is the southern part of the Kern County area, all the
3 way north to the Stockton portion of the San Joaquin
4 Valley, we will be speaking in one voice.

5 So I come today to speak in one voice regarding
6 a particular route that will be hotly debated regarding
7 the Altamont Pass and Pacheco Pass.

8 I can tell you that the San Joaquin Valley
9 strongly prefers the Altamont Pass for a number of
10 reasons. First, it serves more population centers.
11 Second, substantially shorter travel time to Sacramento.
12 In fact, it's 41 minutes shorter from the Bay Area.
13 It's ten minutes slower travel time to San Jose. Travel
14 times from L.A. Area to San Francisco and from the
15 Valley locations to San Francisco would be about the
16 same. And although the Altamont alignment capital cost
17 would be slightly higher, to the tune of about 1
18 percent, the annual operating cost would be \$80 million
19 lower.

20 So for those reasons and a number of others
21 that we will submit in writing, we believe that the
22 Altamont Pass is the preferred pass when asked the San
23 Joaquin Valley folks.

24 So I look forward to future opportunities to
25 speak before you. Thank you for these important

PSSF6-1
Cont.

1 meetings, and we applaud your efforts in getting this
2 underway. Thank you.

3 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you.

4 Michael Sydnor, representing More Rail Limited
5 Liability Corporation. Good afternoon.

PSSF7-1

6 MICHAEL SYDNOR: Thank you, your Honor, Judge.
7 It's nice to be before you.

8 First of all, again, Michael Sydnor. Our
9 company is More Rail. More Rail stands for Montage Of
10 Rail Experiences, Restoring An Intimate Legacy. That is
11 a way to understand the importance of railroad history
12 here in California. Particularly I'm thinking about
13 Alameda County in Oakland.

14 I am a San Francisco citizen, but we have a
15 facility in Oakland, the 16th Street Depot, that is
16 about to be demolished possibly, due to the developers
17 that are there. We'd like to work on the design and
18 creating the elements that possibly can create some of
19 the wonderful facilities that have already been created
20 in this state that can be used as a terminal for what --
21 for the High-Speed Rail.

PSSF7-2

22 So our point with More Rail is to act as
23 advocates, only not only for minorities like the
24 Greenlining scenario -- because we know that minorities
25 are not going to be represented fully in this process.

1 We know that they're going to be the service industry.
2 We know that they're going to be the people that do any
3 of the hard labor work that will be involved. They will
4 be the people that will be the beneficiaries of the
5 High-Speed Rail. It will not be the persons -- or most
6 of the people that will be operating -- or passengers on
7 the rail.

8 So we have to get past the passengers. We have
9 to look at the economic development process here and how
10 it is affecting the minority communities. And when it
11 comes to the minority community, we know that when
12 they're -- for instance, even streetcars, light rail
13 vehicles in communities, crime goes down, tourism
14 increases, there is a boom in economic development.

15 Just by -- look at T Street line. And you can
16 ask the Mayor and the Chief of Police, "Has crime
17 decreased just with the T Street line coming into San
18 Francisco?" It has. And that was one of the hardest
19 corridors for African-Americans.

20 And crime -- when you bring in transit, you
21 reduce crime. What happens is, you're employing people.
22 And that employment process includes not only the kind
23 of travel that -- for instance, that occurs in Europe,
24 where the European rail system is very vital. For
25 instance, if you were to go there, it's like a mall.

PSSF7-2
Cont.

1 You walk in, you know that there's a destination.

PSSF7-3

2 What is not happening here is cultural
3 destinations are not also being included. And that's
4 what I'd really like to put on the table here because,
5 as you begin to think about what High-Speed Rail does,
6 it affects cultures, communities, and economic
7 development situations.

8 And More Rail would like to make sure that you
9 understand the impact of High-Speed Rail, particularly
10 on the minority communities, on the historic development
11 opportunities you have in front of you, and on the
12 cultural development possibilities that would increase
13 the tourism and other safety factors that High-Speed
14 Rail would do.

15 And I thank you for this opportunity.

16 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you.

17 I'm going to call a couple of names at once so
18 people know the order. Next is David Schonbrunn of
19 TRANSDEF. And he'll be followed by Jerry Vail, who will
20 be followed by Dale Champion.

PSSF8-1

21 DAVID SCHONBRUNN: Thank you very much, your Honor.
22 David Schonbrunn, President of TRANSDEF. These are
23 preliminary comments based on having read the summary
24 and heard a presentation at MTC. We will be providing
25 full written comments later.

PSSF8-1
Cont.

1 I wanted to repeat some wise words that were
2 said at the meeting on the Regional Rail Plan for the
3 Bay Area. And that is that High-Speed Rail is far more
4 than just a way of getting from Los Angeles to
5 Sacramento -- Los Angeles, Sacramento, and San
6 Francisco. It's not just an airport substitution
7 process. It fills an extraordinary gap in the state's
8 transportation network, namely adding additional
9 inter-regional capacity.

10 As Supervisor Rubio just said, there is a
11 tremendous need for further service in the Altamont
12 corridor. High-Speed Rail does provide that service
13 very well. And the reality is there is nobody to serve
14 south of San Jose in terms of a commute shed. So the
15 Pacheco alignment makes no sense when you look at the
16 state's need for inter-regional service, which is a way
17 of making efficient use of a very expensive
18 infrastructure.

PSSF8-2

19 Along those lines, I want to point out -- and
20 this is my primary comment today -- what I can only call
21 a silly conclusion in this EIR. And that is the
22 conclusion that, in the Altamont-based case, that San
23 Jose would receive half of the service that would be
24 going to San Francisco.

25 Well, that's a flaw in the development of the

1 alternative. If we go back to purpose and need and
2 recognize the need to develop inter-regional service,
3 you would include in that base case more service between
4 San Jose and Fremont, Warm Springs, or wherever the
5 transfer point would be. And as soon as you start
6 adding a lot of service along that line, San Jose is
7 getting top-notch service in terms of connecting to
8 High-Speed Rail.

9 And the job of High-Speed Rail is to connect
10 well to everybody and to all these major cities. So
11 with a mere correction in terms of adding regional
12 service between San Jose and a transfer point, then that
13 whole issue about San Jose receiving less service
14 completely goes away. And then you're able to judge
15 these alternatives very clearly, and you end up seeing
16 that Altamont simply makes much more sense.

17 Thank you very much.

18 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you.

19 Now, I neglected to honor a team entry. For
20 some reason, the card was misplaced. So if you will be
21 patient, Mr. Vail, I will call Christian Gonzalez
22 Rivera, who also represents Greenlining Institute and
23 was destined to follow Ms. Nieves.

24 CHRISTIAN GONZALEZ RIVERA: Thank you very much for
25 your time.

1 So as he said, my name is Christian Gonzalez
2 Rivera, and I'm also with Greenlining Institute. And my
3 comments will dovetail with those of Andrea as well.

4 So let's hear this talk about Californians who
5 don't have many transit options. You have students,
6 youth under 17, the elderly, disabled, and lower income
7 people all depend on public transit for their mobility.
8 The vast majority of these groups depend on our bus
9 systems, which are always in the front lines of budget
10 cuts to public transit. The situation for lower-income
11 people is especially alive, because support generally
12 exists for other groups that I mentioned but not for
13 lower-income people -- not for our lower-income workers.

14 Inequitable developments produce pockets of
15 poverty and disenfranchisement in our inner cities.
16 Flawed policies that promote sprawl place new housing far
17 from the reach of lower-income people, both spatially
18 and financially. Good jobs follow new housing and
19 escape the grasp, once again, of the disenfranchised in
20 the city. This kind of development makes it extremely
21 difficult for a non-driver in California, whether it's
22 by choice or by circumstances.

23 But let's think about why people drive. They
24 drive because it's still the most convenient way to get
25 around for most people. The development of decisions

1 that shape our state, such as our sprawled metropolitan
2 areas, our ever-widening roads, and our substantially
3 under-funded public transit systems, have led to the
4 transportation crisis that we now face.

5 Building a high-speed intercity rail system is
6 not going to affect the average worker's choice to drive
7 to work, shopping, and recreational activities.

8 Building this system will not alter most of our
9 developers' preference for building single-family,
10 low-density subdivisions.

11 In short, the High-Speed Rail will not protect
12 us from the misguided development scourges that threaten
13 the quality of our air, our water, our soils, and
14 ultimately, our health.

15 The High-Speed Rail Plan is just another
16 example of the kind of inequitable development that has
17 been raising the cost of living in California to a level
18 that's completely out of reach for lower and
19 moderate-income Californians who include the majority of
20 people of color in our state.

21 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you --

22 CHRISTIAN GONZALEZ RIVERA: Money is being poured
23 into new housing, jobs, and transportation options for
24 higher-income people, leaving the majority of the state
25 to spend more of our time on congested roads and more of

1 our money on expensive housing.

2 If our state and local leaders are truly
3 committed to improving the transportation options for
4 all Californians, accommodating future growth, and
5 protecting our environment, you will have to put a lot
6 more on the table than plans for high-tech trains with
7 dubious and largely unsubstantiated claims about the
8 benefits to the state economy.

9 Those \$100 billion are much better spent on
10 improving our bus systems in all the metropolitan areas.
11 It could also be spent in expanding our public subway
12 and light rail systems, which can then pave the way for
13 workable, higher-density development in our existing
14 urban areas as opposed to new greenbelt development.

15 In the end, the money spent on affordable
16 transit within metropolitan areas will pay greater
17 dividends per dollar invested in terms of growth
18 potential for all regions, equitable access of areas of
19 job growth for people of all incomes and races,
20 environmental relief, and also increased feasibility of
21 reintroducing a high-speed rail system sometime in the
22 future.

23 The basic one is this: Growth should be for
24 everyone. Public investment should benefit the whole
25 public, not just a select few. All Californians, rich

PSSF9-1
Cont.

1 or poor, do their part to keep a diverse California
2 running. Therefore, the proceeds of our success should
3 be for all.

4 Thanks.

5 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Jerry Vail and then Dale
6 Champion and then Jim Haas.

PSSF10-1

7 JERRY VAIL: I'm Jerry Vail from San Francisco.
8 I'm here to support the Altamont route.

9 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: I think maybe if you raise
10 that speaker -- yeah.

PSSF10-2

11 JERRY VAIL: In previous meetings, there were
12 concerns that San Jose-L.A. travel time would be longer
13 and there would be half as many trains. And I think the
14 previous speaker made the point correctly that the
15 number of trains will depend on the market and what
16 ridership there is for any given city pair. So
17 adjustments will be made. And it could be that San Jose
18 will get more or less, depending on what the ridership
19 will be.

20 Also, the fact that it's longer -- it's only
21 ten minutes. I'm not concerned that it's only two more
22 minutes from San Francisco to L.A. with the Pacheco
23 route. I don't think, seriously, a longer route from
24 the two end points from San Jose would make that much
25 difference.

PSSF10-3

1 Also I think there's a misplaced emphasis on
2 the end points -- always San Jose or San Francisco or
3 L.A. And as has been mentioned, it's really the
4 intermediate points that give High-Speed Rail its
5 strength because that will connect places that don't
6 have good service now, that have very high airfares,
7 that have long drives and very awkward travel times like
8 Fresno and Merced and Stockton and those places.

PSSF10-4

9 I also might mention that the Valley, which is
10 where the high growth areas are -- has a number of
11 lower-income population. And many of them live in the
12 traditional downtown core areas that High-Speed Rail
13 would serve. So I think that would be an excellent way
14 to bring service to lower-income people.

PSSF10-5

15 In closing, I asked the Authority to consider
16 the interest of the entire Bay Area, the entire state,
17 and support the Altamont route over the Pacheco.

18 Thank you.

19 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you.

20 Dale Champion. It's deja vu all over again.

21 DALE CHAMPION: Good afternoon --

22 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Except you were there.

23 Mr. Champion was a champion San Francisco
24 Chronicle reporter in his salad days, which are not yet
25 behind him.

PSSF11-1

1 DALE CHAMPION: I'm glad to hear that. We're going
2 to stick around, aren't we.

3 I'm an Angelino by birth, and I've been a
4 resident of San Francisco for over 50 years. And I come
5 here to strongly support the alignment that would bring
6 High-Speed Rail into San Francisco. San Francisco has
7 demonstrated its commitment to the High-Speed Rail on
8 numerous occasions and, just recently of course, the
9 Transbay Terminal project is moving -- it's begun to
10 move forward. And I urge you not to delay in any way on
11 this -- on this very important California project. And
12 I commend you for all the work you've done so far.

13 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you.

14 James Haas and then Michael Mahoney and then
15 Charlie Cameron.

PSSF12-1

16 JAMES HAAS: Judge Kopp, Commissioners, I'm Jim
17 Haas. I've been involved with the Transbay Area
18 Citizen's Advisory Committee for years, and I'm a
19 supporter of High-Speed Rail.

PSSF12-2

20 I wanted to comment on the completeness of the
21 draft EIR in an aspect which, in the past, has gotten
22 short shrift, which is the premise that was put forth
23 long ago, that the High-Speed Rail would help address
24 the condition of intra-state air travel. The ability of
25 the state to accommodate flights from Los Angeles to San

PSSF12-2
Cont.

1 Francisco is already under pressure. In fact, a week or
2 so ago, there was a preliminary report relating to the
3 capacity of the San Francisco Airport and suggested that
4 the High-Speed Rail was -- might very well be necessary
5 to accommodate and eliminate some of the smaller planes
6 that come in.

7 We also know that air service from the Valley
8 towns to San Francisco to L.A. has also been, over the
9 years, compromised by costs and other things. I can't
10 say at the moment how good it is or how bad it is, but
11 certainly they've been subject to a lot of difficulty in
12 getting good air service. The High-Speed Rail would
13 greatly improve that problem.

PSSF12-3

14 So when preparing the plans, San Francisco as
15 the terminus is certainly something I'd support, being a
16 San Franciscan. But in my mind, the San Francisco
17 International Airport is almost and may be as important
18 a destination for the High-Speed Rail. And I want to

PSSF12-4

19 make sure that the EIR looks at that aspect and the
20 substitution of High-Speed Rail for -- and help deal
21 with the growth in intra-state air service and make sure
22 that whatever arrangements are proposed in Millbrae can
23 accommodate a large number of travelers who will be
24 using the airport to go internationally or across the
25 country. Thank you very much.

1 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you, Mr. Haas.

2 Mr. Mahoney, Mr. Cameron, and Kurt Evans.

3 MICHAEL MAHONEY: Good afternoon, Judge Kopp and
4 Members of the Committee. My name is Michael Mahoney.
5 I live in San Francisco.

6 The purpose of an environmental impact report,
7 of course, as you know, is not to decide what policy
8 should be adopted but rather to advise the policy makers
9 on what the undesirable consequences will be if that
10 policy is adopted. In that respect, the report before
11 you, in my view, is an attempt to put a thin coat of
12 lipstick on an unattractive date.

13 I want to limit my discussions to the questions
14 of noise. There is a section in the report relating to
15 ambient noise and noise around the train. Anyone who
16 has ridden the high-speed trains in Europe knows that
17 noise is a concern. The train is going through the
18 countryside. There is nothing to see but fields. A
19 habitation appears in the distance, and as soon as you
20 see that habitation, a wall comes up between you and the
21 habitation. The wall is a sound wall designed to
22 protect the citizens from the noise. This habitation is
23 maybe one or two kilometers away from the train.

24 So we may inquire, "What will the noise be if
25 people were standing virtually next to the train?" And

1 that is what you propose.

2 In the Peninsula corridor, the schedule time
3 between San Francisco and San Jose is 30 minutes. It is
4 50 miles. I was there this morning. Obviously, then,
5 the train has to go at an average of 100 miles per hour.
6 But in fact, it goes faster. It goes 125 to 150 miles
7 per hour.

8 There will be 96 trains per day. The distance
9 between the High-Speed Train and the platform is not
10 entirely clear from the diagrams, but it appears as if
11 someone standing on a platform in, let's say, Menlo Park
12 waiting for a local train will be about 15 feet away
13 from the high-speed train when it comes punching through
14 at about 125 miles an hour. To say that the noise
15 caused by that is moderate strikes me as ludicrous.

16 What I was looking to see -- and maybe it was
17 there and I didn't see it -- was diagrams showing the
18 number of decibels that are generated 10 meters from the
19 train, 100 meters from the train, 1,000 meters from the
20 train so that you get some idea of what the noise
21 footprint is going to be. Instead, we're told it's
22 either medium or low or high.

23 In the San Joaquin Valley, many of the trains
24 are proposed to stop at various places. But you can't
25 get to Los Angeles in 2 1/2 half hours by stopping.

PSSF13-1
Cont.

1 There will be express trains that stop nowhere. These
2 trains will be going right through the heart of Modesto,
3 right through the heart of Merced, the heart of Fresno,
4 the heart of Bakersfield at 225 miles per hour. Someone
5 standing on the platform in Merced Station will be 23
6 feet 7 inches from the center of the high-speed track
7 when the train comes through at 225 miles per hour.

8 A huge number of people live within, let us
9 say, one or two kilometers of this right of way. All
10 these people will be affected by this noise. The
11 discussion, as far as I can see in the report, is
12 completely inadequate in that regard. I suspect that,
13 if a serious report were done, many of the enthusiasts
14 in the San Joaquin Valley would begin to lose some of
15 their enthusiasm, and we might see the project
16 redesigned in a more sensible fashion.

17 Thank you.

18 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thanks, Mr. Mahoney.

19 Mr. Cameron and then Mr. Evans. And after
20 Mr. Evans, Jennifer Johnson and then Jim Lazarus.

PSSF14-1

21 CHARLIE CAMERON: Good afternoon, Commissioners.
22 The name's Charlie Cameron. I'm a Hayward resident.
23 First of all, I came here because I will not be able to
24 make your Tuesday meeting in Oakland.

25 Mr. Leavitt, I want you to know I will be

PSSF14-1
Cont.

1 sending in corrections, grammatical corrections and
2 mistakes, erroneous oversights. But I already know --
3 and I've been to the Oakland Main Library once. I've
4 been to the Fremont Main Library once. I'm prefacing
5 the word "main," because that's where I had to go. But
6 it was incorrectly stated -- that the documents are in
7 the main library not any library.

PSSF14-2

8 The grammatical mistakes that I did say deal
9 with the word "Capital Car." A number of pages have the
10 wrong word and spelling of the word "Capitol." I don't
11 know how many times this document has been proofread,
12 pre-proofread, scanned, and it's still made mistakes
13 that Mr. Leavitt's got to worry about and cringe as we
14 speak.

15 What else is wrong? There are other mistakes
16 that I did and have written up that I will be sending
17 in.

18 You have a tough job to do. I'm a hard-core
19 rail person, years back. So I will be sending in my
20 comments. Thank you very much.

21 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you, Mr. Cameron.

22 Kurt Evans.

PSSF15-1

23 KURT EVANS: Thank you, your Honor, Commissioner
24 Diridon. My name is Kurt Evans. I'm the government
25 affairs manager for the Santa Clara Valley

1 Transportation Authority or VTA for short. I wanted to
2 make a few comments this afternoon to the Authority.

3 VTA strongly supports the concept of a
4 high-speed rail line as a way to relieve highway and air
5 traffic congestion between Northern and Southern
6 California.

7 We also believe that a Pacheco Pass alignment
8 makes the most sense as the entry point for High-Speed
9 Rail into the Bay Area. In 2005, the California
10 High-Speed Rail Authority's draft statewide program
11 EIR/EIS concluded that Pacheco Pass was the better
12 alignment because, A, it provides better frequency of
13 service to the critical Silicon Valley job market; B, it
14 more effectively and efficiently meets current and
15 future intercity travel demand and thus is a better fit
16 for High-Speed Rail's basic project objectives; and C,
17 it does not require a new bay crossing to serve San
18 Francisco, which would pose considerable challenges.

19 In our opinion, the information presented in
20 the Authority's draft Bay Area-to-Central Valley
21 High-Speed Train Program EIR/EIS does not change those
22 conclusions.

23 I would like to make a few brief points.
24 First, the Pacheco Pass alignment will provide faster,
25 more direct and more frequent service to all three of

1 the largest urban centers in the Bay Area: San Jose, San
2 Francisco, and Oakland.

3 Second, to demonstrate the need for direct
4 High-Speed Rail service to San Jose, consider that the
5 Authority's draft statewide program EIR/EIS estimated
6 that by 2010, the Mineta San Jose International Airport
7 would have more flights serving the Bay Area to Southern
8 California market than the Oakland and San Francisco
9 airports combined.

10 Third, as one of the partner agencies in the
11 CalTrain Commuter Rail Service, VTA believes a Pacheco
12 Pass alignment is more consistent with CalTrain's
13 corridor-wide, long-range plans.

14 And finally, air traffic between Bay Area and
15 Southern California will continue to grow in the future.
16 But all three major airports in the Bay Area are
17 severely constrained in terms of their ability to
18 expand.

19 The Bay Area-Southern California air traffic
20 corridor is already one of the busiest in the nation,
21 and it will only get worse. Therefore, the primary
22 purpose of High-Speed Rail should be to provide a
23 competitive, long-distance transit alternative between
24 Northern and Southern California. And the Pacheco Pass
25 alignment is the best alternative for achieving that

PSSF15-1
Cont.

1 purpose.

2 Thank you for your consideration of our
3 comments.

4 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you, Mr. Evans.

5 And Jennifer Johnson -- and then Mr. Lazarus --
6 Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley.

PSSF16-1

7 JENNIFER JOHNSON: Good evening. My name is
8 Jennifer Johnson, and I'm here today to provide the
9 working position on High-Speed Rail as adopted by the
10 Board of the California Partnership for the San Joaquin
11 Valley.

12 As you may know, the partnership is a unique
13 public-private collaboration created by Governor
14 Schwarzenegger. Led by our appointed Board, the
15 Partnership has engaged thousands of people in the
16 eight-county San Joaquin Valley to focus on action
17 strategies that improve the economic vitality and
18 quality of life for Valley residents.

19 On August 9th, the Partnership held a special
20 meeting in the Valley on High-Speed Rail, obtaining
21 comments from a large and diverse group of stakeholders.
22 The following day, the Partnership Board adopted the
23 following working position:

24 High-Speed Rail needs to serve the entire San
25 Joaquin Valley, Bakersfield to Sacramento. And the

1 region must stay together as it works towards
2 implementation of the initiative. \$15.5 million must
3 stay in the 2007-2008 budget as a minimum funding level.
4 The High-Speed Rail ballot measure must stay on the 2008
5 ballot.

6 The federal government needs to contribute to
7 the High-Speed Rail Project. Congress should seriously
8 consider the establishment of a federal High-Speed Rail
9 Authority, with powers similar to California's
10 Authority.

11 Passenger rail is also a priority for the
12 Valley and is meeting immediate demand, while the
13 High-Speed Rail initiative will address mid- and
14 long-term demand.

15 Land-use patterns are a critical success factor
16 for High-Speed Rail. The blueprint regional planning
17 process needs to be tightly connected to the efforts to
18 implement High-Speed Rail in the Valley. And the route
19 between the San Joaquin Valley and the Bay Area will
20 have a significant impact on the Valley being served as
21 an entire region.

22 We anticipate amendments to this position may
23 soon be made to provide particular direction to this
24 body regarding a preferred alignment alternative. We
25 will be sure to share those with you as soon as

PSSF16-1
Cont.

1 possible.

2 I also want to thank the Authority for working
3 with us to pursue an additional meeting in the Central
4 Valley. We believe that two public hearings held in the
5 Valley will provide stakeholders in the region a more
6 sufficient opportunity to comment on the study,
7 including the preferred alignment and station location
8 options.

9 Thank you.

10 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you, Ms. Johnson.

11 Mr. Jim Lazarus, San Francisco Chamber of
12 Commerce.

PSSF17-1

13 JIM LAZARUS: Good afternoon. I think I have the
14 privilege of saying "welcome back," Supervisor Kopp, to
15 your chambers. It's an inside -- as a former deputy
16 city attorney when Supervisor Kopp -- we worked together
17 in this room.

18 The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce's number
19 one infrastructure project is California High-Speed
20 Rail, its impact on CalTrain extension to Downtown San
21 Francisco, and the completion of a new intermodal
22 transit hub at First and Mission.

23 The key issues that we believe must be dealt
24 with in coming up with alignment decisions are that an
25 alignment must bring downtown-to-downtown service, San

1 Francisco to Los Angeles as a primary
2 passenger-generating route for High-Speed Rail to be
3 successful.

4 The other testimony you heard this afternoon
5 regarding impacts on the Valley, impacts on other
6 point-to-point travel are all well taken. But your
7 studies show that the number one passenger-generating
8 route will be passengers getting on and off
9 downtown-to-downtown.

10 Secondly, I think you've also heard -- and I'm
11 not going to repeat it in any great length -- the
12 importance of routes that tie High-Speed Rail to our
13 airport infrastructure throughout the state. Recent
14 studies show that airport congestion -- we're not going
15 to be able to build our way out of it in San Francisco,
16 Oakland, San Jose, or in most of California. But we can
17 move shifting travel to High-Speed Rail, especially
18 those short-haul routes, getting rid of small aircraft
19 which provide as much congestion to carry 50 passengers
20 as a 747 does to carry 300 passengers.

21 So we need to align this system to look 50
22 years down the road on its impacts on reducing airport
23 congestion.

24 Finally, we need to look at routes that tie
25 infrastructure projects on transit -- whether it's

1 train, bus, light rail, airlines, and transit village
2 developments -- throughout Northern California,
3 especially in the immediate Bay Area, as was mentioned
4 in Redwood City, already looking forward to High-Speed
5 Rail to extension of CalTrain service at a higher level
6 with 2500 units, as was mentioned there, Downtown San
7 Francisco with thousands of units in the pipeline within
8 walking distance of an expanded and rebuilt First and
9 Mission Transit Center.

10 So these alignments are going to really dictate
11 the infrastructure, growth, and how we accommodate
12 people in California for the next probably 100 years, as
13 we developed water policy, education policy, and highway
14 policy in the 1950s for the state we have today, like it
15 or not; that's what we have.

16 And I think your decisions and the decisions of
17 the voters in making these alignment decisions, making
18 these route and station decisions are going to dictate
19 the quality of life for another hundred years in
20 California. So we're strongly supportive, at the
21 Chamber, of this project. We urge you to move forward
22 with this. We urge the Governor to maintain adequate
23 funding for this project. And we look forward to
24 supporting a State bond issue in 2008.

25 Thank you.

1 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you.

2 Gwynn MacKellen, Sierra Club. And then Jane
3 Morrison and then Margaret Okuzumi.

4 GWYNN MacKELLEN: My name is Gwynn MacKellen. I
5 work with the local Sierra Club.

6 High-Speed Rail will benefit all of California
7 because we all share the same air. Air pollution is a
8 very serious problem in California that hurts the poor
9 and minorities the most. The numerous effects of
10 climate change are also significant. As we run out of
11 oil, it will be the poor who won't be able to afford the
12 high gas prices.

13 Cheap air flights, like cheap gasoline, cannot
14 go on forever. We need to think very long term as we
15 plan our State's transportation future. Expanding the
16 highways and airports will be far more expensive than
17 the High-Speed Rail and will have much more negative
18 environmental and human costs.

19 As our population continues to grow and we
20 reach the end of cheap oil, California must have a
21 solution in place to move people through the state
22 quickly, efficiently, and with the lowest environmental
23 impact.

24 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you very much.

25 Madam Reporter, are you all right?

1 THE REPORTER: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.

2 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Well, for your
3 information, I have six more prospective witnesses. Do
4 you think you can stay with it?

5 THE REPORTER: Yes.

6 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Otherwise we'd take a
7 break, Jane, but okay.

8 All right. Jane Morrison.

PSSF19-1

9 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: I can't -- I have no
10 suggestions, as long it comes -- High-Speed Rail comes
11 to Downtown San Francisco and that it can take me to the
12 zoo in San Diego and bring me back to San Francisco at
13 dinner.

14 I'd like to thank Judge Kopp and Mr. Morshed
15 and the staff for working hard to give us High-Speed
16 Rail. And I'd also like to thank all of you for
17 supporting High-Speed Rail. It's really been a terrible
18 fight, and we may or may not win tomorrow when the
19 Governor decides to sign the budget. But it might be
20 good if we all called the Governor's office tonight and
21 told him what we think of him if he's doing it for us.
22 I will be 100 years old in 2020, and I want to ride
23 High-Speed Rail before then.

24 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you. Now, did you
25 recognize Mr. Dale Champion? Of course you did.

1 Margaret Okuzumi from the Bay Rail Alliance.

2 Proceed.

PSSF20-1

3 MARGARET OKUZUMI: I'm Margaret Okuzumi with Bay
4 Rail Alliance. And we've been supporting High-Speed
5 Rail for several years. And in 2001, some of you
6 remember, we organized a forum on High-Speed Rail. It
7 was sponsored by the Mineta Transportation Institute and
8 many other organizations.

9 As you know, we -- California needs to build
10 it. It would cost twice as much money to expand
11 freeways and airports to provide a proven amount of
12 capacity, you know, money that the State certainly does
13 not have. We certainly hope that the Governor funds
14 High-Speed Rail.

15 And we applied the policies that you've been
16 putting together to encourage more compact land use and
17 more intense development around station areas.

PSSF20-2

18 We do have some concerns about the EIR and some
19 of the modeling that is assumed. Now, in your original
20 productions, you had found that about two thirds of the
21 riders going to the Bay Area would be going to San
22 Francisco and one third to San Jose. And I think that
23 you need to ask yourselves if the function of High-Speed
24 Rail is to provide a line-haul service to where you're
25 having partially empty trains going between San

1 Francisco and San Jose.

2 Why not do as the French and some other
3 agencies do, where they split the trains. So you run
4 the trains, and you run full trains, and people sit in
5 certain sections of the train, depending on where you're
6 going. And you can split them, but you can maintain the
7 frequency. That way, you don't have to force an impact
8 along the whole populated Peninsula, where you have all
9 these trains running but not stopping at most places.

10 And also, we're concerned that -- about future
11 travel to Sacramento when High-Speed Rail is extended to
12 Sacramento. There's such a significant time difference.
13 I mean, 40 to 45 minutes between San Francisco and
14 Sacramento with the two alignments. Also to the number
15 of kilometers of track that are indicated in your EIR is
16 about double with the Pacheco route versus Altamont.

17 We believe San Jose would be perceived to be a
18 much more significant city if it were an end point for
19 High-Speed Rail. Considered from the perspective of the
20 traveler, you arrive at the station; there is a train
21 waiting for you that's empty, or there's train waiting
22 so that you can arrive a little bit ahead of time and --
23 instead of having to jump onto a train that is mostly
24 full and stopped for 30 seconds in San Jose or whatever,
25 we frankly don't understand why San Jose is trying so

1 hard to be a stop on the way to San Francisco.

2 The population is much greater in the San
3 Joaquin Valley in terms of the corridor versus the Los
4 Banos corridor. The top two congested corridors that
5 MTC found in its most recent highway study was in the
6 580 corridor, 580 westbound in the morning and eastbound
7 in the afternoon. And that was the top two out of the
8 ten -- top ten corridors, whereas this time around, none
9 of the South Bay corridors made it into the top ten.

10 We would like to see High-Speed Rail make a
11 direct stop at the San Jose Airport terminals rather
12 than at a station where it would be -- people would have
13 to transfer to a peplemover.

14 And so we think that, you know, the modeling
15 assumptions need to be examined. We're frankly quite
16 surprised that you didn't find a greater difference
17 between the Altamont and Pacheco ridership. And I think
18 your modeling assumptions are a reason for that.

19 And also, you know, our mission as a rail group
20 is we would like to facilitate the development of a
21 whole Bay Area rail network, regional rail network. And
22 the Altamont route would enable a dramatic improvement
23 that, you know -- ACE might be able to share tracks and
24 really help facilitate the whole completion of a
25 regional network and given the population also in all

PSSF20-2
Cont.

1 the corridors and, you know, perhaps facilitate
2 Dumbarton Rail and so forth. So at this point, we are
3 supporting the Altamont route, and we continue to
4 scrutinize the EIR. Thank you.

5 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you, Ms. Okuzumi.

6 Next, the Mayor of the City and County of San
7 Francisco, the Honorable Gavin Newsom.

PSSF21-1

8 MAYOR GAVIN NEWSOM: Thank you, members of the
9 Authority. I appreciate very much you being here in San
10 Francisco. And thank you for your leadership and
11 stewardship of this process. It's a little over a
12 decade in the making formally and decades informally in
13 the making.

14 I've got to say, part of me wants to sit here
15 and give perfunctory remarks, talk about the importance
16 of Pacheco Pass, making sure the terminus ends at our
17 new Transbay Terminal, our beautiful new intermodal
18 center that we're committed to advancing here in the
19 City. All that goes without saying.

20 But what I want to reinforce is I am a little
21 concerned about what's going on with this project
22 because I'm not sensing that there's the kind of
23 imperative in leadership, with the exception of those in
24 this room here today and a few others, that's necessary
25 to deliver this project. And I'm befuddled by that.

1 I'm absolutely confused by that. I'm concerned about
2 that.

3 And I'm mesmerized that folks can come up here
4 and talk about, "Well, we just need more cars, more
5 highways. We need more congestion, more pollution and
6 more airport runways," or make the argument circularly,
7 saying, "We need other things," as if that will somehow
8 happen and then the idea will be advanced in spite of
9 the fact, when Jane's a hundred years old in 2020, we're
10 not going to have 33 million people living in this
11 state; we're going to have 45 million people. And
12 they're going to be doing what? They're going to be
13 going where? And how are they going to get there? I'm
14 just dumfounded.

15 I mean, this is a debate we're having in the
16 State of California, the leader in so many areas. And
17 we're still arguing over it. And we're arguing over a
18 pittance of money. I'm embarrassed that we're sitting
19 here worried about the Governor lining out \$15 million.
20 That's embarrassing. \$47 million dollars in a state
21 budget -- how many hundreds of billions of dollars have
22 we spent? We get 47 million cumulative in the last
23 decade for this effort?

24 I'm not -- I can't even tell you where we spent
25 \$47 million. I'll give you 300 examples in San

1 Francisco for things that pale in terms of the
2 significance to the High-Speed Rail. We're talking
3 about hundreds of thousands of jobs, not just during the
4 construction period but hundreds of thousands of jobs
5 afterwards. We're talking about one of the great public
6 works projects -- you could take it from that
7 perspective -- in our nation's history.

8 You want get serious about the environment?
9 Give me a break. I could sit here and tell you, "We do
10 more on solar. We do a little bit here on alternative
11 fuel vehicles, a little hybrid here." It's a joke.

12 You want to get serious, get serious about
13 public transportation. You want to get serious, get
14 serious about getting people out of their cars and give
15 them a positive alternative.

16 No, it's not the tyranny of "or," of, "Well, we
17 have to do this or we can't do that." You can do both.
18 It's the proverbial genius event. People still use
19 planes; people still use cars, of course. You've got to
20 give them a positive alternative. And I believe it will
21 compete and out-compete.

22 I think there's a reason -- you know, airlines,
23 if they feel really threatened, I assure you, they're
24 going to be up here spending plenty of money to beat
25 this. Right now, they're not so threatened because they

1 don't see much leadership. And in an era where
2 leadership comes and goes, people are termed out, they
3 have not much to fear, frankly.

4 With the exception of folks like yourselves,
5 who are saying, "Jesus, I'm living in a parallel
6 universe." All the rhetoric about the environment, all
7 the rhetoric about intermodal transportation, all the
8 rhetoric about in-fill development, smart growth, all
9 that rhetoric -- and here we have the chance to do what
10 other countries have demonstrated uncontrovertibly is
11 the way to go -- all the evidence in the world -- and we
12 say, "Oh, I'm not so sure. Maybe we'll give you a few
13 million dollars just to keep your lights on."

14 I'm serious; I'm just dumfounded. So I guess
15 I'll some responsibility as mayor. I've got to get more
16 forceful on this. But I've always felt, well, why --
17 you know, I'm just a mayor. And you've got all those
18 legislators, you've got all those statewide folks. And
19 you know, with a couple of exceptions -- thank you,
20 Fiona Ma and a few others -- I'm not sensing that
21 anyone's really getting this.

22 So we'll work hard with Nancy Pelosi to start
23 getting this. We'll work hard with Diane Feinstein and
24 Senator Boxer. This is a big deal. This is a huge
25 deal. And our grandkids are going to look back, and

1 they're just going to be befuddled that we were still
2 arguing it and we never delivered on this promise.

3 So I guess my point to you is, keep it up.
4 Thank you for being here. We'll keep fighting for you.
5 And I believe in this. And I guess I'm -- you know, as
6 Mayor, I kind of forget often that I'm the mayor. I'm
7 just a guy who lives here -- I'm going to do what I can.
8 Hopefully I'll be here in the next four years to really
9 step this up.

10 And you know, if we have to shame folks into
11 doing the right thing, that's what we'll do. But I'm
12 not going to sit here and listen to people I admire on
13 some hand telling me it's a terrible thing and talk
14 about this somehow hurting poor people. I'm dumfounded
15 by that. I'm really concerned about that, actually.
16 That's really, frankly, what got me off my chair in my
17 office a minute ago and ran down here. It should be --
18 this is the exact opposite of what I was expecting to
19 hear from my friends at Greenlining and others. We need
20 to sit down with them and explain this a little bit
21 differently.

22 But we've got to fight for this. And I, again,
23 just want to thank you all for your leadership and
24 encourage you again to get that terminus into the new
25 Transbay Terminal we're building. Thank you again.

1 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you very much,
2 Mayor.

3 Yu Hanakura and then John Diamante and then
4 Will Spargur. And then the last person will be Richard
5 Mlynarick.

6 YU HANAKURA: Hello everybody. I currently live in
7 San Francisco, but I original born in Japan, right near
8 by the high-speed rail track in Japan. I know how noisy
9 it is. But let me tell you about three things.

10 One, please discuss about alternative which
11 track even finish before -- even far before San
12 Francisco, because what's important is to get the
13 High-Speed Rail built, not to reach San Francisco. I
14 have two reasons why. One, by ending the High-Speed
15 Rail track even before San Francisco, you can cut the --
16 you can use the cost and shorten the construction
17 period. And that's actually happened in Korea. In
18 Korea, high-speed rail system end even before Seoul,
19 like, the primary station in the capital of the country.

20 And second reason, in the urbanized area,
21 high-speed train can't get the top speed. Like in
22 Tokyo, every single high-speed rail line terminating in
23 Tokyo slows down when the train is entering the greater
24 Tokyo area. And sometimes high-speed rail is slower
25 than local commuter trains in some sections.

PSSF22-1
Cont.

1 And I heard once CalTrain tested nonstop
2 service between San Francisco and San Jose. And the
3 train -- that's 41 minutes, 41 minutes by heavy diesel
4 train pulled by 3600-horse powered diesel engine. And
5 in today's Wall Street Journal Marketplace, it says that
6 Amtrak is getting more passengers on the East Coast
7 corridor because even with, like, slow Acela express
8 service between Boston, New York, and Washington, D.C.,
9 passengers get -- sorry, I lose the word.

10 Anyway, as long as the train connects in an
11 area in San Francisco or near the destination and train
12 runs reasonably fast compared to other travel, more
13 passengers are going to choose High-Speed Rail for sure.
14 That's what this article says in Wall Street Journal in
15 the Marketplace section today.

PSSF22-2

16 And the second thing is, please discuss about
17 the impact --

18 Bless you; gesundheit.

19 Please discuss about the impact on the existing
20 passenger rail service in California, especially in the
21 urban areas because I don't see any section in the EIR
22 talking about this issue. Because, for example,
23 CalTrain is lining up to capacity, and it will be at
24 capacity in the future, maybe 20 years or -- 20 years,
25 especially during peak hours. And there is no room

PSSF22-2
Cont.

1 for -- I don't think there is a room for lining on
2 high-speed train during commuter hours.

3 Although you guys built an extra two -- the
4 double-track corridor between San Jose and San
5 Francisco, low-speed conventional commuter rail service
6 and the high-speed rail trains can't coexist upon the
7 same track because of the different acceleration and the
8 different top speed and the different stopping pattern.

9 And if the commuter service is to be used on
10 the CalTrain corridor just for -- just to add the
11 high-speed train service during the peak hour, commuter
12 are going to choose the other alternative, which is
13 driving, and it can increase traffic volume.

14 That's about it. Thank you.

15 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you.

16 Mr. Diamante.

PSSF23-1

17 JOHN DIAMANTE: Thank you, Judge.

18 Good afternoon, all.

19 I just want to say thank you for your efforts,
20 and we, the benefitees, must expand and amplify the
21 California High-Speed Rail statewide constituency.

22 So, the best California High-Speed Rail system
23 sooner.

24 Thanks.

25 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you.

1 Mr. Spargur.

2 WILL SPARGUR: Thank you, Judge. I'm Will Spargur,
3 and I'm a construction engineer.

4 And I used to work at San Francisco
5 International Airport. And one of the things that
6 bothered me the most about working there -- and this is
7 before the BART extension actually went down to the
8 airport -- is that I'd have to take -- let me back up.

9 I live in Oakland, California, so I'm traveling
10 from Oakland to SFO. And I'd have to take BART down to
11 Colma and then switch to a bus and take a bus to the
12 airport. And you can imagine how long that -- and on
13 days when it was raining, the bus would not be
14 coordinated with the train, so it would even take that
15 much longer.

16 And the reason I bring this up is because I
17 would like to say a couple of words in favor of bringing
18 the High-Speed Rail directly to Downtown San Francisco
19 as opposed to first going to Oakland or using Fourth and
20 King as the terminus. And part of that is because
21 Downtown Oakland is the only place in the Bay Area that
22 has a highly developed regional transit hub where you do
23 not see that in Oakland [sic], or you don't see that
24 especially at Fourth and King. If you got off at Fourth
25 and King, you -- let's say if you were going to Marin,

1 you'd want to take Golden Gate Transit, you would need
2 to transfer to Muni or take a cab to Downtown San
3 Francisco and then catch the bus from there.

4 And the same thing if you're in Oakland. I
5 guess either it would stop at 12th Street -- or there's
6 other Downtown Oakland locations. But it's not
7 really -- Downtown Oakland is not really developed to
8 handle -- once passengers get into Downtown Oakland, you
9 don't have the infrastructure to get them to their
10 actual destinations because Downtown Oakland is most
11 likely not going to be one of their destinations.
12 They're going to use that as a jumping-off point to get
13 to wherever they're going.

14 So that's basically the gist of what I wanted
15 to say is that it should come into Downtown San
16 Francisco because that provides the most widely
17 developed transit hub in the Bay Area, if your plan is
18 to get people to their destinations once they get into
19 the Bay Area.

20 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you, Mr. Spargur.

21 Mr. Mlynarick.

22 RICHARD MLYNARICK: Good afternoon, Judge Kopp,
23 Mr. Diridon and others. Thank you for your patience
24 this afternoon.

25 As an engineer, one thing I would like to say

1 about this entire process is that if -- and you could
2 only hope that the High-Speed Rail comes to California,
3 for the good of the world, actually -- if that would
4 happen, we only get one shot at doing this correctly.
5 With the best will in the world, there isn't infinite
6 money. We have to use the money we have as wisely as
7 possible. In particular for the High-Speed Rail line,
8 we're going to have a huge amount of bonding in order to
9 construct this. We're probably going to have private
10 contributions.

11 All of this means that every second that the
12 trains are sitting there or the tracks are sitting
13 there, they're depreciating. So it's really important
14 that, whatever we do, we achieve maximum utility of the
15 assets, maximum public return on our investment, and
16 maximum return on private investments.

17 So from that point of view, as well as points
18 I'll go into later, I think the Altamont route into the
19 Bay Area is by far the best route for Northern
20 California and for California as a whole and for a
21 number of reasons.

22 The first point is that a high-speed rail line
23 constructed at a cost of tens of millions of dollars a
24 mile has a lot of capacity. Given some discipline, one
25 can shove nearly 15 to 20 trains per direction per hour

1 along that line. But the question is, what happens when
2 they get to stations? What happens when they get to the
3 Transbay Terminal? There is no way that you can send 20
4 trains, 15 trains an hour into a dead-end and reverse
5 them back out.

6 So the thing to understand about operations of
7 rail in general and the High-Speed Rail in particular in
8 Northern California is that you have a lot more capacity
9 getting into the Bay Area than we can deal with at any
10 one location.

11 So points that have been made as to, "Oh, we're
12 going to have a terrible problem if we have to have this
13 split service," is actually inevitable because
14 otherwise, we're going to have tracks which are unused
15 because we can't run enough trains into the terminals.

16 So in fact, a split between major termini in
17 the Bay Area is going to be required and will actually
18 maximize the public's use of this investment.

19 If you look at, for example, the San Jose
20 downtown, CalTrain has plans to run between eight and
21 ten trains an hour into that terminal. You've got the
22 Amtrak long distance, Capitol corridor. There will be
23 Gilroy to San Jose trains that terminate there with the
24 CalTrain being the main shuttle service further up the
25 corridor.

1 So mixing that in with every single high-speed
2 train coming through that station is going to result in
3 a lot of expensive infrastructure needed to accommodate
4 this, which may not be necessary; not everybody wants to
5 go to San Jose. Likewise in San Francisco, we have a
6 six-track terminus at the Transbay Terminal, and we're
7 trying to shove maybe ten CalTrans an hour in there.
8 And then we try to put four or six high-speed trains an
9 hour -- this is just a number that's not going to fit.

10 So I think there's a huge operational advantage
11 if we can segregate the people who don't want to go to
12 San Francisco, they can go to San Jose. People who
13 don't want to go to San Jose can go to San Francisco.

14 Another point is that, along the CalTrain line,
15 basically every high-speed train that runs between San
16 Jose and San Francisco, if we chose the Pacheco
17 alignment, takes away the opportunity to ride the
18 CalTrain's express train. CalTrain has basically made
19 all of its ridership improvements -- I think it's gone
20 up 30 percent in the last few years -- through the
21 people who ride those long-distance express trains.

22 But there's an inherent conflict that if you
23 have -- there's a high-speed train and a high-speed
24 express train. There's only so many you can put on one
25 track at one time.

1 Fundamentally, we have a choice about whether
2 to spend a lot of money in a very urban area between San
3 Jose and San Francisco with horrific NIMBY mitigation to
4 allow more trains to run, or whether it would be more
5 cost-effective for the state as a whole to perhaps spend
6 that money in the Livermore Valley, where there's a
7 growing population, but it's nowhere like the San
8 Francisco Peninsula.

9 My next point is that the Altamont route serves
10 entire markets for the entire Bay Area that are just not
11 touched by the Pacheco route -- like the Tri-Valley
12 area, Livermore area, San Ramon, Bishop Ranch. These
13 are all important business centers, important
14 residential centers of the Bay Area which will receive
15 high-quality service both inter-regional and statewide
16 from an Altamont route which are not touched. In
17 contrast, if we look at routing through the Pacheco
18 Pass, we gain service to Los Banos.

19 Another point I'd like to make is that the
20 Altamont route is the only route that provides any
21 service, any effective service between the Bay Area and
22 Sacramento. If we were to build the Pacheco route,
23 we're basically saying High-Speed Rail will just not
24 serve that market, that the Bay Area to Sacramento is
25 something we'll keep chugging along up the Capitol

1 corridor at 50 miles an hour indefinitely.

2 So I'll make comments in writing, but to
3 summarize, I'd say that our job -- your job -- our job
4 as advocates, yours as responsible stewards -- is to
5 maximize return on investment with our political and our
6 fiscal capital. It's to serve all of California as well
7 as possible. It's to maximize the round network of
8 Northern California because many trains can serve -- can
9 use these tracks. We have to make sure that there's as
10 many trains as possible running and the tracks aren't
11 sitting empty.

12 We need to maximize the utility of stations and
13 not -- it's basically infinitely expensive to double
14 what's already an infinitely expensive Transbay
15 Terminal. So there's only so many trains that are going
16 to go there. We should make sure it's not too many.

17 And the last point is, we need to serve as many
18 people in California as possible. And I believe that
19 running through the Altamont Pass will serve as many
20 people in Northern California as possible.

21 Thank you.

22 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you.

23 And the last speaker, Colette Crutcher, Sierra
24 Club.

25 COLETTE CRUTCHER: Hello. My name is Colette

1 Crutcher. I'm a volunteer with the Sierra Club.

2 Sorry.

3 Is that better?

4 I'm a volunteer with the Sierra Club. I'm not
5 really representing the Sierra Club. I'm just here as a
6 citizen. I can't add a lot to what's been said in favor
7 of High-Speed Rail except that I grew up in Europe and
8 on the East Coast, where trains are used much more than
9 down here. I was just back East visiting recently and
10 traveling on a train. And it wasn't a high-speed train.
11 I wish it had been. But even so, going downtown to
12 downtown was such a huge time saver, avoiding the
13 airport, the security checks, all that stuff that you
14 have to go through; you have to add on about three hours
15 in advance of your departure when you're flying.

16 And train travel is psychologically so much
17 more pleasant. It's so low stress. You can get work
18 done. You can relax. You -- I think it would really
19 improve the quality of life in urban areas if we use
20 trains more.

21 Thank you.

22 HONORABLE QUENTIN KOPP: Thank you.

23 Well, I thank everybody for their time and
24 their attention. And we will now close this public
25 hearing. Tomorrow we will be meeting, as stated, in

1 City Hall in San Jose for the second such public hearing
2 of public comment on the Draft EIR/EIS Bay Area to
3 Central Valley.

4 And I express appreciation on behalf of the
5 Authority, for those who have displayed not simply the
6 interest in terms of commentary on the Draft EIR/EIS,
7 but also in terms of the aspiration of the members of
8 the Authority, the staff, and I think most Californians,
9 to insure implementation of 200-mile-per-hour or
10 higher-speed trains in California, soon, in this
11 century.

12 This public hearing is concluded.

13 I'll add to my previous announcement that the
14 staff, the California High-Speed Rail Authority, will
15 remain in this room until 6:00 p.m. in the event others
16 want to discuss or comment to them on the Draft EIR/EIS.

17 (Whereupon, the proceedings concluded at
18 5:51 o'clock p.m.)

19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
2 COUNTY OF MARIN) ss.

3 I, DEBORAH FUQUA, a Certified Shorthand
4 Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify
5 that the foregoing proceedings were reported by me, a
6 disinterested person, and thereafter transcribed under
7 my direction into typewriting and is a true and correct
8 transcription of said proceedings.

9 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
10 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
11 foregoing proceeding and caption named, nor in any way
12 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
13 caption.

14 Dated the 11th day of September, 2007.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

DEBORAH FUQUA
CSR NO. 12948