

5 normal alternative.

6           The first part of my comment addresses  
7 alternatives to the airport runway expansion as a  
8 solution to airport capacity problems. The draft EIR  
9 assumes that additional runways will need to be built in  
10 order to deal with the increased air passengers that  
11 will occur if the high-speed rail project is not built.  
12 However, there are alternative methods of increasing  
13 airport passenger capacity that do not deter the  
14 environmental impacts of runway construction.

15           One well-recognized alternative to the  
16 additional runway construction is the use of larger  
17 aircraft. Passenger capacity at airports is dependent  
18 in part on the size of the aircraft used at the  
19 airports, and an increase in aircraft size allows an  
20 airport to move a larger number of passengers without  
21 increasing the number of flights.

22           There are environmental benefits to larger  
23 aircraft as well. The San Francisco study on flight  
24 delay concluded that larger aircraft are more  
25 fuel-efficient, and they generally also reduce crew cost

0052

1 per seat. They also reduce noise and air pollution.  
2 The draft EIR/EIS states that the use of larger aircraft  
3 is an unbeatable solution to the demand for intercity  
4 trips. This conclusion is reached in part because  
5 airports other than LAX and SFO would require expansion  
6 to accommodate large aircraft.

7           I have two objections to this conclusion:

8           First, the SFO-to-LAX route is currently the  
9 largest intercity route in the state, and large aircraft  
10 could be used there to meet the demand.

11           Second, most other airports listed are capable  
12 of using up to 135 passenger aircrafts, but many  
13 carriers are only using 30- and 35-seat aircraft on  
14 these routes, allowing for significant expansion. While  
15 using large aircraft may not be on its own a complete  
16 solution to air traffic management, it should be  
17 included in the study of modal alternatives.

18           The second part of my comments address  
19 alternatives to road construction as a solution to road  
20 capacity problems. Again, here the draft EIR assumes  
21 that new road lanes will need to be constructed in order  
22 to deal with the increase in road usage that will occur  
23 if the high-speed rail project is not built. However,  
24 there are also here alternative methods of alleviating  
25 road congestion that will free up additional capacity

0053

1 for predicting an increase in intercity trips.

2           The first alternative is to further develop  
3 intracity public transport network such as subway, light  
4 rail, and bus systems. Although this is not a direct  
5 increase in intercity transport capacity, it indirectly  
6 creates such an effect by decreasing intercity road  
7 trips, and this, in turn, creates road capacity in and  
8 around cities, decreasing the bottlenecks given the

PH-SF021-1  
cont

9 intracity transport.

10 The second alternative applies similar logic  
11 to longer-distance commuter trips. Systems such as the  
12 Baby Bullet and the recently suggested MAGMA system in  
13 LA have the ability to alleviate congestion on --

14 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Excuse me. You've gone  
15 over your three minutes. If you could finish up and  
16 submit the written comments to us.

17 MR. RATCLIFF: That's about all I have.

18 The final EIR should consider the impact that  
19 these alternatives will have on the currently proposed  
20 modal alternative.

21 Thank you for allowing these comments.

22 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much.

23 And at this moment I'd like to break in and  
24 recognize Bob Infelise, who a professor at Boalt Law  
25 School who invited me to speak to his class on the EIR

0004  
1 for high-speed rail. And many members of his class are  
2 here today to assist us with their comments. And I  
3 appreciate it. And I very much appreciate the  
4 specificity and the level of analysis that we've already  
5 seen in the first speaker.

6 Jamie Schwartz?

7 (No response.)

8 Mark Maler.

9 MR. MALER: Good afternoon. My name is Mark  
10 Maler. I'm also one of the students who attend the  
11 workshop class at Boalt Hall. And as Joseph Petrillo  
12 remembers, we were pretty engaged when he was there  
13 attending our class giving a speech. And I was thankful  
14 for this opportunity to comment.

15 I was actually thinking that I was going to be  
16 among the latter speakers, but I'd like to first talk  
17 about the importance of cost analysis within the EIR and  
18 EIS.

19 I understand the document is supposed to be an  
20 environmental document. But the fact is, is that when  
21 you are allowed to take a look at the cost analysis and  
22 cost projections and cost estimations of a given public  
23 project, it gives the public the ability to have a  
24 greater understanding, greater appreciation, and ability  
25 to actually analyze whether or not the project is

0005  
1 feasible and that the costs projections are able to be  
2 met.

3 And the reason why I bring this up is because  
4 the section I want to specifically address is the land  
5 use within the EIR/EIS. And I believe -- as much as I  
6 am for the high-speed rail project, I think that there  
7 are certain legal problems in which we must fix there.

8 The legal obligation of the Authority is  
9 basically to provide for analysis of reasonable  
10 mitigation -- I mean, a reasonable analysis of what are  
11 likely mitigation costs. And if you take a look at  
12 EIR/EIS, you see that throughout the document there are  
13 many sections in which you discuss mitigation on needs

PH-SF021-1  
cont

PH-SF021-2

PH-SF022

PH-SF022-1

14 and administration requirements, of sound walls in order  
 15 to insulate certain sound-sensitive areas within urban  
 16 cities in order to provide for -- in order to provide  
 17 for the sensitivity within those areas.

18 And I think that because of the fact that  
 19 within EIR/EIS you talk about the fact that some of  
 20 these walls will need to be, quote, unquote,  
 21 appropriately dimensioned, this can impact land use and  
 22 urban planning because we really have no way of knowing  
 23 how much these walls are going to cost, but they have to  
 24 be appropriately dimensioned.

25 So I guess the best way for me to talk about  
 0056

1 the proposal is that I really think you can provide for  
 2 a very reasonable method of analysis in your revisions  
 3 in which you have EIR and EIS in the upcoming future.  
 4 And the way in which you will do this is if you take a  
 5 look at the EIR/EIS, you provide for analysis of Bay  
 6 Area California by sections, and you can also talk about  
 7 land use and possible mitigation costs by talking about  
 8 how much it would cost the Authority to acquire money  
 9 for certain square feet of easements or other related  
 10 matters in order to accommodate for these mitigation  
 11 costs, design needs, and other such things.

12 CHAIMAN PETRILLO: You're running over the  
 13 three minutes.

14 MR. MALER: I see you nodding even before I  
 15 finished my sentence. But thank you.

16 CHAIMAN PETRILLO: Would you submit a  
 17 written -- your written comments?

18 MR. MALER: Of course.

19 CHAIMAN PETRILLO: Thank you.

20 I have to apologize at this moment to our  
 21 court reporter who has been going on and haven't paid  
 22 any attention to the fatigue factor. So I will call a  
 23 recess of ten minutes.

24 (Recess taken.)

25 CHAIMAN PETRILLO: All right. The next

0057

1 speaker on our list is Sky Stanfield. And the next  
 2 speaker would be Craig Jucckniess.

3 MS. STANFIELD: Good afternoon. My name is  
 4 Sky Stanfield, and I'm also a student at UC Berkeley  
 5 Boalt Hall School of Law.

6 Thank you for this opportunity to share my  
 7 thoughts with you on the proposed high-speed rail  
 8 project. While I'm excited that the Authority is  
 9 undertaking this ambitious process of planning for our  
 10 state's increased needs for public transit, I'm  
 11 concerned that it is ignoring its mandate to integrate  
 12 the train with local public transit systems.

13 The California High-Speed Rail Act repeatedly  
 14 refers to the need for the Authority to coordinate with  
 15 urban transit systems. While the primary goal of the  
 16 act is to help create an intercity transit system, it  
 17 recognizes that in order to make this realistic, it must  
 18 tie in with effective local systems.

PH-SF022-1  
 cont

PH-SF023

PH-SF023-1

19           The purpose and need in the EIR also states  
20 that it is necessary to effectively interface with these  
21 mass transit systems in order to -- and I quote --  
22 "relieve capacity constraints of the existing  
23 transportation system in a manner sensitive to and  
24 protective of California unique resources."

25           This need, however, seems to have gone  
0058

1   unaddressed in the EIR. Currently the Authority seems  
2 to be relying on the build-it-and-they-will-come method  
3 of planning by putting great weight on the assumption  
4 that the cities where the stations are located will  
5 automatically implement public transit systems that will  
6 have effectively -- will effectively move persons to and  
7 from the high-speed rail stations.

8           I'd like to highlight two examples of this:  
9           First, in the Traffic and Circulation section  
10 of the draft EIR, it is noted that at various proposed  
11 stations including San Francisco, the project will  
12 result in a traffic flow level of service rating of F,  
13 which, just like in grade school, stands for failure.

14           In San Francisco, if the station is located at  
15 the Transbay terminal, the EIR suggests that the impact  
16 may be counteracted by high usage of transit in the  
17 downtown area but provides absolutely no further reason  
18 to believe that the Authority had a plan for bringing  
19 about such transit. The EIR admits that it will have  
20 no -- and I quote -- "potential impact on public transit  
21 conditions compared to the no project alternative."  
22 This is a massive problem if the train is going to be  
23 picking up and depositing thousands of passengers a day  
24 into downtown San Francisco, Los Angeles, Fresno, and so  
25 on;

0059

1           Second, in a few places the Authority is  
2 considering stations located outside of the downtown  
3 centers -- for example, in Sacramento and Bakersfield --  
4 I notice that these options would require the addition  
5 of transit services but does not provide anything  
6 further in terms of how to ensure those services are  
7 developed.

8           Currently the EIR provides only one sentence  
9 on how it plans to mitigate these effects. This, I  
10 fear, is woefully inadequate. I understand that the  
11 program EIR is intended to analyze and to disclose to  
12 the public the environmental effects and benefits of the  
13 proposed program and its alternatives, and that it is  
14 not required to fully scrutinize each component of the  
15 project at this time. However, I feel as a voter,  
16 taxpayer, and commuter that I am not capable of making a  
17 decision about whether to support a bond or any further  
18 steps in this process without knowing more details about  
19 how the Authority plans on integrating rail with local  
20 transit systems so as to relieve the significant impacts  
21 that the EIR has identified. I ask you to return --

22           CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Excuse me. You're running  
23 over the three minutes.

PH-SF023-1  
cont

24 MS. STANFIELD: One sentence left.

25 I ask you to return to the document and

0060

1 include a more satisfying explanation of the possible  
2 mitigations that can then be further addressed in the  
3 later station-specific EIS.

4 Thank you very much.

5 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Can you make sure you leave  
6 the comments.

7 Craig Jucckniess. And then followed by John  
8 Holtzclaw.

9 MR. JUCCKNIESS: Good afternoon. My name is  
10 Craig Jucckniess. I'm also a student at Boalt Hall  
11 School of Law.

12 I'd like to address the ridership projections  
13 or the assumptions that underlie a lot of the analysis  
14 and the -- in the EIR/EIS.

15 The ridership essentially determines a  
16 viability of the high-speed rail project. The project  
17 will need a certain number of passengers per year to  
18 cover its operating costs. And the EIR/EIS business  
19 plan makes the assumption that the high-speed rail, once  
20 complete, will attract 42 million annual passengers and  
21 generate at least \$880 million in annual revenues. So  
22 meeting this target ridership is really a pivotal  
23 assumption. What happens if the project does not meet  
24 its ridership goals? The projected relief of traffic  
25 congestion on the highway and air modes may not take

0061

1 place. The high-speed rail system may not be able to  
2 pay its own O&M expenses through revenues. Nor will it  
3 be able to meet its bond debt, let alone will the  
4 revenues from the initially operable stages of the  
5 system from the cost of construction of the future  
6 stages of the system, as the project apparently  
7 contemplates.

8 Fares may have to be raised to generate  
9 additional revenues, with obvious consequences. And the  
10 claimed environmental benefits of the high-speed rail  
11 alternative as compared with the no project modal  
12 alternatives will not be fully realized, such as  
13 amelioration of continued degradation of air quality  
14 savings in energy consumption and reduction of land use  
15 impacts.

16 So what's the ridership break-even point for  
17 project viability? Well, the EIR doesn't really tell  
18 us. It doesn't tell us what the necessary revenue over  
19 and above costs is necessary in order to meet the  
20 project's multiple objectives. The projected revenue  
21 for the \$42 million -- 42 million passengers is  
22 \$880,000,000. But the business plan and the EIR only  
23 compare operating costs to revenues. There's no  
24 discussion of revenues that will also be required to  
25 service bonds and to construct the subsequent legs.

0062

PH-SF023-1  
cont

PH-SF024

PH-SF024-1

1 Attracting ridership from the other modes of  
 2 transportation is a crucial assumption of project  
 3 success. The business plan in the EIR project that  
 4 45 percent of the train riders -- high-speed rail  
 5 riders -- will be taken from the air mode of travel.  
 6 And that's -- 56 percent of all intercity air passenger  
 7 traffic in year 2020 is going to jump to the high-speed  
 8 rail system. And in order for that to happen, the  
 9 high-speed rail system is going to have to be very  
 10 competitive and very attractive.

11 And there are four attractiveness features  
 12 that the EIR analyzes, and I'd like to quickly address  
 13 two of them:

14 One is the competitive travel times. Many of  
 15 the advantages that the EIR claims that the high-speed

16 rail mode has over air mode are very slim margins. For  
 17 instance, the flagship route between LA and  
 18 San Francisco, the high-speed rail only has a 3 percent  
 19 advantage in travel time over the air mode. And my  
 20 question is, how precise travellers are in calculating  
 21 their travel time in order to come down to a 3 percent  
 22 analysis of the difference between the two. And is  
 23 high-speed rail really going to attract over half the  
 24 air travel population when there's only a 3 percent  
 25 difference?

0063

1 I'd also like to quickly address costs.  
 2 Again, one of the key factors that the EIR recognizes  
 3 can influence passenger choice of travel modes. The --  
 4 in particular, I'd like to compare the car versus  
 5 high-speed travel modes. And I believe the EIR and its  
 6 tables that compare these two modes are misleading.  
 7 They base the total car operating costs as the  
 8 comparative measure based on literally every cost that  
 9 goes into operating a vehicle. And it doesn't limit  
 10 itself to the perceived or direct costs that a car  
 11 driver actually -- actually exhibits -- actually incurs.

12 CHAIMAN PETRILLO: Excuse me. You're running  
 13 over your three minutes. Wind it up and submit to us  
 14 your written comments.

15 MR. JUCCKNISS: I'd just like to conclude  
 16 saying that if the -- the key factor of direct costs is  
 17 so much lower for car and for city travel than for rail,

18 then the car passengers are not really going to be  
 19 attracted out of their cars and onto the rail. And,  
 20 similarly, for travel time they're not going to be  
 21 attracted out of the airplanes and into the high-speed  
 22 train cars.

23 CHAIMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much.

24 MR. JUCCKNISS: Thank you.

25 CHAIMAN PETRILLO: John.

0064

PH-SF025

1 MR. HOLTZCLAW: Chairman Petrillo, members of  
 2 the commission. I'm John Holtzclaw. I'm chair of the

PH-SF024-1

PH-SF025-1

3 Sierra Club's Transportation Committee. You've heard  
4 from one Sierra Club speaker today. You'll hear from  
5 more.

6 We are putting together statewide comments.  
7 Hopefully they'll be shorter than the EIR itself. I  
8 want to focus on something that --

9 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: We hope so also.

10 MR. HOLTZCLAW: I want to focus on something  
11 that Mayor Brown talked about and Tom Radulovich talked  
12 about and Sky talked about.

13 This high-speed rail system has the potential  
14 to move people out of cars, out of airplanes into trains  
15 if it's done right. As Mayor Brown says, it needs to  
16 have its stations in city centers. San Francisco is the  
17 model. It should be like that as much as possible  
18 throughout the state. If we build park-and-ride  
19 stations at freeway -- where it crosses freeways or  
20 outside of the downtowns in Bakersfield and other  
21 cities, we'll have people driving to it, we'll pave over  
22 parts of the Central Valley and other valleys. That is  
23 not acceptable. We need to build so that people walk to  
24 it -- because this is a pedestrian system -- so that  
25 people walk and take transit to it. We need to improve

0065

1 our transit systems. We do not need to build parking  
2 lots around it.

3 We're concerned about sprawl. That's a  
4 primary national campaign in the Sierra Club. And why  
5 are we concerned about sprawl? It's not just because of  
6 where it occurs, but comparing northeast San Francisco  
7 near here at a hundred households per residential acre  
8 with the average of sprawl about three households per  
9 residential acre, sprawl consumes thirty times as much  
10 land per family. It requires that much more pavement.  
11 People drive. They own three times as many cars. They  
12 drive four times as much. It's a much higher level of  
13 consumption in pollutants in sprawl than  
14 in pedestrian-oriented areas. So we have to make sure  
15 that we build a pedestrian-oriented rail system.

16 Thank you. We'll be submitting comments in  
17 writing.

18 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much. We  
19 look forward to your comments.

20 I'd especially like to ask the Sierra Club to  
21 look at that analysis on sprawl that is in the  
22 Environmental Impact Report and the way it relates to  
23 the other modal alternatives and give us your opinion on  
24 that specifically and on the alternative locations for  
25 the stations.

0066

1 MR. HOLTZCLAW: We will.

2 MR. DIRIDON: Mr. Chairman, I think out of  
3 deference to John of the Sierra Club -- John is the vice  
4 president of the Sierra Club in charge of this topical  
5 area -- the cities of Los Angeles, Bakersfield, Fresno,  
6 San Jose, San Francisco have all indicated that they  
7 want the stations downtown. Indeed in those cities the

PH-SF025-1  
cont

8 only stations that are in the alternatives remaining are  
 9 smack-dab in the downtown areas. So we're heading in  
 10 the right direction. There are a few cities still  
 11 debating the issue, and we hope that they will come  
 12 along in the vain that you've indicated.

13 MR. HOLTZCLAW: It certainly concerns us.  
 14 Thank you.

15 CHAIMAN PETRILLO: Thank you.  
 16 Jacey Glassman. And then Reda Dennis to  
 17 follow.

PH-SF026

18 MS. GLASSMAN: Hello. I'm Jacey Glassman,  
 19 with Boalt Hall as well. I'm going to stick to my three  
 20 minutes and submit my comments. But what I'd really  
 21 like to comment on is travel time because it's an  
 22 essential element to the purpose and success of the  
 23 high-speed train.

24 The Authority has based travel time on four  
 25 components: Access time, terminal time, line haul, and  
 0067

1 arrival time. Putting aside the fact that the time  
 2 suggested by the Authority is based on the optimal time  
 3 without interference with other trains or stops in  
 4 intermediate locations, it appears to me that the travel  
 5 times associated with the high-speed rail are still  
 6 inaccurate and fail to adequately take into  
 7 consideration the potential impact of high-speed rail on  
 8 traffic and transit as required by CEQA.

9 First, with regard to the terminal times, the  
 10 EIR/EIS does not consistently address the operational  
 11 issue of congestion that will result from the rail's  
 12 shared use with freight and conventional passenger rail.  
 13 Congestion plays a heavy role in reliability and wait  
 14 time. And, for instance, according to the California  
 15 Department of Transportation, presently Amtrak and  
 16 Metrolink experience delays on an average of 30 percent  
 17 of the time.

18 In assessing the alignments, the EIR/EIS only  
 19 discusses congestion for three routes, and none of those  
 20 routes are aware where present alignments are most  
 21 congested. The EIR/EIS fails to address congestion  
 22 along the line of most concern, which is Merced all the  
 23 way to Los Angeles; the Los Angeles to the Inland Empire  
 24 along the Union Pacific and Burlington lines.

25 So if the Authority claims that wait time will  
 0068  
 1 be minimal because of the high-speed rail's reliability,  
 2 how can reliability be assessed without congestion being  
 3 determined?

4 Second, with respect to access and arrival  
 5 times, the EIR/EIS does not really address how traffic  
 6 around the station will affect accessibility. Appendix  
 7 3.1 does discuss that traffic around those stations will  
 8 increase, but it does not discuss the effects of that  
 9 increase. And furthermore, the increase in traffic  
 10 appears to be associated with station usage only.  
 11 Nothing evaluates the traffic that will result in  
 12 increase in population and employment in the station's

PH-SF026-1

PH-SF026-2

13 vicinity. So I would ask that a cumulative impact of  
 14 station usage, traffic, and growth of traffic be  
 15 addressed in order to properly assess access and arrival  
 16 times.

17 Thank you very much.

18 CHAIMAN PETRILLO: Thank you.

19 Reda Dennis, followed by Catrina Fabian.

20 MR. DIRIDON: Mr. Chairman, just so the record  
 21 is clear and so no one leaves here misunderstanding,  
 22 this system will not use joint tracks with freight  
 23 anyplace. There will be a little bit of joint usage  
 24 coming into San Francisco, as planned with the Caltrain  
 25 system on the express tracks possibly, but in no place

0069

1 on the system will the tracks be jointly used with  
 2 freight. They will all be brand-new tracks exclusively  
 3 dedicated to high-speed train system.

PH-SF027

4 MS. DENNIS: Good evening. My name is Reda  
 5 Dennis. And I will be specifically addressing NEPA and  
 6 CEQA requirements for alternatives with regards to the  
 7 current EIR/EIS. And I'd like to draw an analysis to  
 8 your business plan to sort of give you an idea of what  
 9 NEPA and CEQA require of an EIR/EIS.

10 Just as a business plan is used to determine  
 11 approximate costs and means of offsetting those costs,  
 12 so, too, is the EIR/EIS intended to approximate  
 13 environmental costs of the project and means of  
 14 offsetting those costs. If the costs in a business plan  
 15 are not as accurate as possible, the project is doomed  
 16 to failure. So, too, if the environmental costs  
 17 approximations are not made as accurate as possible, the  
 18 effects can be ruinous. In the present case, this truth  
 19 is even more apropos because the programmatic EIR is  
 20 effectively a go/no-go on the project. Waiting until  
 21 the project's alternative levels to discuss possible  
 22 damage are both imprudent and impossible to justify in  
 23 light of potential environmental devastation from a lack  
 24 of foresight.

25 The point is to determine whether the benefits

0070

1 outweigh the risks and costs. That is impossible to do  
 2 without having the best idea possible of what those  
 3 risks and costs are. Therefore, I would urge the  
 4 High-Speed Rail Authority to more specifically detail  
 5 the effects of environmental impact with regards to  
 6 alternatives and to suggest that the High-Speed Rail  
 7 Authority consider more alternatives than the ones being  
 8 considered thus far.

9 The primary reason for this is that the EIR  
 10 fails to consider the reasonable range of alternatives  
 11 to determine whether the current choice of action is the  
 12 least environmentally destructive. NEPA requires that  
 13 if you choose a route that is not the least  
 14 environmentally destructive, you have to explain why,  
 15 and as with CEQA. And with the current instance there's  
 16 really only one alternative being considered: Either  
 17 the Pacheco route or the Diablo route. And, really,

PH-SF026-2  
cont

PH-SF027-1

18 that's only one small measure of the entire route.  
 19 And at this point I'd like to also point out  
 20 that although the EIR discusses a no-development  
 21 alternative, that alternative is not considered within  
 22 the range of reasonable alternatives, according to NEPA  
 23 and CEQA. Therefore, I'd like to urge the High-Speed  
 24 Rail Authority as a means of discussing these  
 25 alternatives to look specifically at the Altamont route.

0071

1 And I'd like to outline four specific reasons why this  
 2 route should be considered as my final point before the  
 3 High-Speed Rail Authority today.

4 The first is that the EIR/EIS does not  
 5 adequately study the Altamont. In addition to being a  
 6 less expensive option and, according to the San Mateo  
 7 County Transportation Authority, the cost of building  
 8 the bridge would rather be a quarter million as opposed  
 9 to the billions that have been suggested. Bridge  
 10 crossing is potentially less destructive than running  
 11 the trains through the Henry Coe wetlands and mountains  
 12 or the bird sanctuary south of San Francisco. This  
 13 definitely meets the purpose and needs of the project  
 14 and the statement of project objectives.

15 The second issue I'd like to bring up is that  
 16 although there are concerns about a bridge, there could  
 17 be some environmental benefits of building a new bridge.  
 18 The reason for this is because authorities have stated  
 19 that the old train bridge that currently crosses the bay  
 20 would be removed in order to put a new bridge in place.  
 21 Removal of the old bridge would improve navigation of  
 22 the bay, allow for a rebuild of the approach embankments  
 23 that will help restore some of the bay's natural tidal  
 24 flow, and a new bridge would warrant mitigation and  
 25 enhancement of the potential alternatives.

0072

1 The third point I'd like to point out is that  
 2 tunnelling-in-wetland issues may make the Altamont route  
 3 more attractive than the other proposed routes.  
 4 Statistically speaking, miles of tunnel required for  
 5 Pacheco would be 9 miles; Diablo, 19; whereas, Altamont  
 6 would only require 6 miles of tunneling, which could  
 7 cause pretty large environmental impacts.

8 In addition, going through Altamont as opposed  
 9 to Pacheco or Diablo will result in less damage to  
 10 wetlands and, therefore, most likely less damage to  
 11 habitat and wildlife corridors.

12 CHAIMAN PETRILLO: Excuse me. Your time is  
 13 up. So if you can -- oh, no. You don't have to just  
 14 stop. You can --

15 MS. DENNIS: I would strongly urge the  
 16 High-Speed Rail Authority in accordance with NEPA and  
 17 CEQA, to consider the entire greenbelt alternative and  
 18 not consider Altamont as a possible route alternative.

19 Thank you.

20 CHAIMAN PETRILLO: Okay. Anthony Bruzzone, of  
 21 the AC Transit.

22 MS. FOBIAN: It's actually Catrina Fobian.

PH-SF027-1  
 cont

PH-SF027-2

PH-SF028-1

PH-SF028

23 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Sorry.  
24 MS. FOBIAN: It's okay.  
25 I'm, too, am a student at Boalt Hall, and my  
0073

1 comments specifically are focused on Chapter 3, "The  
2 Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences and  
3 Mitigation Strategies."  
4 Within the purpose and content of Chapter 3,  
5 it specifically states that the purpose of this chapter  
6 is "to evaluate potential environmental impacts  
7 associated with constructing and operating the  
8 high-speed rail alternative." This is located on page  
9 3.0-1.

10 I submit that the High-Speed Rail Authority  
11 has failed to actually present the impacts on the  
12 environment. While there is a multitude of mentionings  
13 written the EIR itself of the area that would be  
14 impacted, the effect on this area is not specifically  
15 addressed.

16 The uniqueness of this project is that no  
17 matter where it goes, it's going to affect the  
18 environment. And what we are looking at is the fact  
19 that this tends to be a very human-focused EIR. There  
20 are a strong lack of discussion on animals and  
21 endangered and threatened species in particular. There  
22 are many studies that have been done on areas that will  
23 be affected by the high-speed rail that could have been  
24 included in the EIR with respect to impact on species.  
25 In particular, the San Joaquin kit fox and the

0074  
1 California red-legged frog have been extensively studied  
2 with -- in relation to the project of UC Merced and  
3 could have been included in this EIR.

4 Also, I submit that in order to adequately  
  
5 present to the public species that will be directly as  
6 well as indirectly impacted, it would be helpful to have  
7 the number and expanse of listed species in the areas  
8 affected listed, as well as the number and expanse of  
9 listed species in areas that are threatened.

10 Ultimately as a voter and as a commuter, it is  
11 important for me to know the effects on endangered and  
12 threatened species that the high-speed rail will have.  
13 The more that these questions are addressed now rather  
14 than later, the more likely that the project will  
15 succeed and that high-speed rail will go forward.  
16 Therefore, even though this is a programmatic EIR, I  
17 urge you to include full disclosure of the eventual  
18 impacts on the environment where the information  
19 concerning these species is readily available.

20 Thank you.  
21 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much.  
22 Anthony Bruzzone, followed by Melanie  
23 Griswold.

24 MR. BRUZZONE: Hi. I'm Tony Bruzzone, and I'm  
25 not from Boalt Hall. I'm actually from AC Transit. I'm  
0075

PH-SF028-1  
cont

PH-SF029

PH-SF029-1

1 here to talk about the importance of running as many of  
 2 trains as you can in the Transbay terminal. It's a  
 3 little unclear from this document exactly how many  
 4 trains we're talking about. And I think our comments  
 5 here are to encourage you to run as many as you can into  
 6 there.

7 We're currently the -- almost the only tenant  
 8 and certainly the largest tenant in the Transbay  
 9 terminal. I got to tell you, it's lonely in there. So  
 10 we really welcome the interest by high-speed rail into  
 11 serving as its facility.

12 We've been working on this project with the  
 13 Transbay Joint Powers Authority for the last two, three,  
 14 four years. This is a great project. It really is a  
 15 great project. It's a great project for the region.  
 16 It's a great project for the state. It will be an even  
 17 better project if we can get the high-speed and  
 18 intercity trains in there. It's -- the more activity is  
 19 always better in a facility like this.

20 More importantly than that, in terms of  
 21 high-speed rail, this is a great location for high-speed  
 22 rail. I mean, it's the best advertisement you could  
 23 ever use because it's right in the middle of the city.  
 24 It's central. It's there. It's your storefront. And  
 25 it's going to be a great storefront.

0076

1 I think it's also interesting the whole  
 2 history of the terminal. In '39 it started out as a  
 3 rail terminal. And then in the late '50s it became a  
 4 bus station. We have the opportunity to return the  
 5 terminal back to what it was; you know, as a first-class  
 6 rail facility. Really, when you think about it, this is  
 7 the first train station that's been built -- and it's  
 8 going to be built -- in this country in, I think, 75  
 9 years. The last one was Los Angeles. I mean, that sort  
 10 of says something about California.

11 We're going to be pleased to serve -- our  
 12 projections show that -- or actually, MTC's  
 13 projections -- show that we'll be serving 50,000 bus  
 14 trips a day in the terminal by 2025. It would be really  
 15 great to have an equal number of Caltrains and  
 16 high-speed rail trips in there too. It's going to make  
 17 for a traffic facility.

18 It's a great building. With high-speed rail  
 19 it's phenomenal. I'm sorry I didn't talk about birds or  
 20 frogs or anything, but I like trains.

21 Thanks.

22 CHAIMAN PETRILLO: Melanie Griwsold, followed  
 23 by Mylene Evered.

24 MS. GRISWOLD: Hi. My name is Melanie  
 25 Griswold, and I'm from Boalt Hall.

0077

1 As you heard, we have several concerns about  
 2 issues that are not fully addressed in the EIS/EIR. I'm  
 3 here to speak you to about safety and security.

4 The recent spate of incidents in Madrid and in  
 5 France indicate that safety and security are primary

PH-SF029-1

PH-SF030

PH-SF030-1

6 importance to the success of the high-speed rail. There  
7 are two issues upon which safety and security could  
8 impact the high-speed rail: Those are time and costs.

9 In terms of the costs, there are two types of  
10 costs that are not included in the analysis in the  
11 EIS/EIR. Those are the costs of construction, which may  
12 include the adaptation of off-the-shelf technology to  
13 meet higher safety and security requirements; whether  
14 chain link fences would be adequate to protect the rail  
15 system, and the costs of implementing security devices  
16 such as screening devices at rail terminals.

17 In terms of the operation, we might also see  
18 enormously increased costs. For instance, when France  
19 was threatened with a bombing on its rail, it had to  
20 employ 10,000 personnel in one day to do screenings and  
21 searches of the trains. These are enormous impacts on  
22 costs that are not addressed in the EIR/EIS.

23 In terms of the impact on time, time is  
24 considered to be one of the key elements of  
25 attractiveness in terms of attracting people from the

0078

1 aircraft onto high-speed rail. The increased screening  
2 time will impact the board times which are estimated at  
3 less than two minutes, on page 3.2-11. The specific  
4 assumption in Table 3.28 of a lower number of incidents  
5 on high-speed rail may need to be evaluated in terms of  
6 these concerns.

7 Any of these factors may not affect the  
8 viability of the project, but they should come into the  
9 analysis when we're looking into the viability or

10 attractiveness of high-speed rail compared to airplanes.

11 Also, the EIR/EIS does not consider the  
12 sensitivity that increased time may have on ridership.

13 Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much.

15 Mylene Evered, followed by Laura Altieri.

16 MS. EVERED: Good evening. My name is Mylene  
17 Evered, and I'm also a student from Boalt Hall School of  
18 Law.

19 I'll be commenting today on three aspects of  
20 the high-speed rail project: First, the role of private  
21 sector financing; second, cost analysis for the project;  
22 and, lastly, the sensitivity analyses conducted in the  
23 business plan.

24 First, I'd like to touch on the Authority's  
25 consideration of private-sector financing as part of its

0079

1 funding scheme for the project. Some of these  
2 options -- like design, build, operate, maintain  
3 contracts, concessions, and vendor financing -- have  
4 been discussed in the business plan and, I imagine, will  
5 be covered in implementation plan.

6 As the Authority considers these private  
7 funding options, it should extrapolate relevant lessons  
8 from existing transit projects. One relevant pattern  
9 shows us that even with a concession model and private

PH-SF030-1  
cont

PH-SF031

PH-SF031-1

10 sector involvement, public subsidies are still necessary  
 11 to sustain this type of transit system. Therefore,  
 12 promoting the rail system as a financially

13 self-sufficient and net-profit-generating business seems  
 14 somewhat misleading.

15 This point is supported by the history of rail  
 16 projects worldwide which tend to be characterized by  
 17 cost overruns and overly optimistic revenue projections.  
 18 The case of the Chunnel in Europe provides some useful  
 19 lessons in this area. Financial projections for the  
 20 project were optimistic, as they are here. After almost  
 21 ten years in operation, it has come to cost about twice  
 22 as much as initially projected, and revenues from  
 23 operations have not been able to cover costs. These  
 24 problems have been due in part to environmental and  
 25 security issues, delays in the construction of links to

0080

1 local transit systems, fierce competition from cheap air  
 2 fares. These factors definitely seem applicable to  
 3 California's own high-speed rail project, especially in  
 4 light of today's security threats borne out by events  
 5 like 9/11 and the Madrid train bombing, as well as  
 6 competitive behavior exhibited by airlines like  
 7 Southwest.

8 So despite the Authority's attractive rhetoric  
 9 about applying a new business investment mind set to  
 10 financing the rail system, we must ask if projected  
 11 costs, ridership, and revenue levels are not met and the  
 12 private sector is not able to internally capture loss,  
 13 what burdens are imposed on taxpayers and on  
 14 California's fiscal health.

15 Next, we also request that the Authority  
 16 provide a comprehensive cost comparison between the  
 17 no-action modal and high-speed rail alternative which  
 18 incorporates external social costs like air pollution,  
 19 noise pollution, and accidents generated by each  
 20 alternative.

21 At this time the only study we have to rely on  
 22 is one conducted by the Institute of Transportation  
 23 Studies at UC Berkeley which concludes high-speed rail  
 24 total costs exceed those of air and highway modes. This  
 25 implies that in California, high-speed rail may not be a

0081

1 cost-effective alternative to auto and air travel.  
 2 Given this finding, we feel that it's important for the  
 3 Authority to undertake this type of comprehensive cost  
 4 analysis so we can better understand the full costs of  
 5 each of the transit alternatives proposed in the  
 6 EIR/EIS.

7 And, lastly, in reviewing the sensitivity  
 8 analyses found in section 3.3 of the business plan, we  
 9 find that it fails to provide a rigorous and complete  
 10 test of ridership and revenue forecast. All of the  
 11 alternative assumptions the Authority used in the  
 12 analyses seemed adjusted in one direction to make the  
 13 ridership in revenue projections look better. These

PH-SF031-1  
 cont

PH-SF031-2

PH-SF031-3

14 sensitivity analyses, however, fail to tell us what  
 15 we're really concerned about: How sensitive are the  
 16 ridership and revenue forecasts to adverse conditions  
 17 such as lower airfares, shorter air and auto travel  
 18 times, increased capacity for air travel and lower  
 19 growth rates --

20 CHAIMAN PETRILLO: Excuse me. You're running  
 21 over your time limit. So --

22 MS. EVERED: I'll wrap it up.

23 CHAIMAN PETRILLO: And please submit your  
 24 written comments.

25 MS. EVERED: Definitely.

0082

1 So, for example, if airlines lower their air  
 2 fares significantly below the price of a rail ticket  
 3 over a period of one or five or ten years, what will be  
 4 the effects on ridership and revenue? And in such a  
 5 case, what level of public subsidy will be necessary to  
 6 keep the rail system running? Subjecting the ridership  
 7 and revenue projections to these types of assumptions is  
 8 critical. Therefore, I urge the Authority to commission  
 9 further analyses using alternative assumptions that  
 10 truly put ridership and revenue projections to the test.

11 Thank you.

12 CHAIMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much.

13 Laura Altieri, followed by Brynly Llyr.

14 MS. ALTIERI: My name is Laura Altieri, and I  
 15 wanted to say that I'm from Boalt Hall as well.

16 And in general we're very supportive of the  
 17 plan. I think that might not be coming across today.  
 18 But there are specific areas we wanted to address.

19 My area is 3.4, the noise section of the  
 20 document. And I'm concerned that given that CEQA  
 21 requires quantification of the environmental impacts,  
 22 there are few areas where this information seems to be  
 23 missing and where the costs may be higher than stated as  
 24 a result. These are five brief points I have to make  
 25 about this:

0083

1 One, construction costs. There's no  
 2 quantification of the noise that will result from the  
 3 excavating, hauling, use of equipment, and laying rail  
 4 in the 15 or 20 years that the project will be under  
 5 construction;

6 Two, I'm concerned that there's not much  
 7 discussion about how the noise levels of the train --  
 8 which I understand is estimated to be about 95  
 9 decibels -- will interact with the various cities'  
 10 general plans that the train will be running through.  
 11 Because a lot of those cities have limits of 80 decibels  
 12 in their industrial areas and then lower in their  
 13 residential areas, which the train may be slated to pass  
 14 through;

15 Third, the elevation. There's mention that  
 16 the track will be elevated in certain chunks, and noise  
 17 is going to have more of an impact when elevated rather  
 18 than grounded. And that should be quantified as well;

PH-SF031-3  
cont

PH-SF031-4

PH-SF032

PH-SF032-1

19 Fourth, the question of the walls running down  
 20 a chunk of California. It appears that the cost  
 21 estimate only estimates if they were to be built on one  
 22 side of the track where, as I imagine to be sound  
 23 mitigation, they would have to be built on both sides of  
 24 the track. So that might be an issue;

25 And fifth, finally, I think it would be useful  
 0084

1 for the EIR to address the noise that will be heard from  
 2 the passengers' point of view when inside the train,  
 3 particularly when in a tunnel or in a section of the  
 4 track which has walls on both sides of it. Because it  
 5 seems to me it could be quite loud inside the train, not  
 6 to mention not particularly scenic.

7 So in conclusion, I would address -- I would  
 8 ask that all of these issues be addressed in the final  
 9 EIR.

10 Thank you.

11 CHAIMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much.

12 Brynly Llyr, and Lionel Gambill next.

13 MS. LLYR: I'm Brynly Llyr, also from Boalt  
 14 Hall School of Law.

15 My question and comments relate to the  
 16 projected costs and ridership numbers in the draft  
 17 program EIR/EIS; specifically, the success of the  
 18 high-speed rail, at least in part, directly relates to  
 19 the project meeting the ridership numbers and staying  
 20 within the cost projections.

21 Since the project will likely be built in  
 22 phases, if the project turns out to be more expensive  
 23 than expected, it raises the possibility that part of  
 24 the project may not be built, that the project may be  
 25 built or may be changed mid-course, or that the

0085  
 1 high-speed rail may not attract the riders necessary to  
 2 support it.

3 Specifically my question is, how will the  
 4 Authority respond if the project turns out to be much  
 5 more costly than anticipated and the ridership minimal?

6 I expect the Authority to assert the  
 7 projections given in the draft document are fully  
 8 supportable. But whether the numbers are supportable,  
 9 that's not the issue.

10 What is the issue is that even with the best  
 11 calculations and intentions, most -- in fact,  
 12 practically all -- large public works projects like this  
 13 end up costing much more than expected. And in the case  
 14 of rail, they have much lower ridership numbers.

15 An instructive example of this -- although it  
 16 doesn't deal with rail -- is Boston's Big Dig, a major  
 17 public work program that was managed in part by one of  
 18 the same parties we have working on these cost  
 19 projections here for the California high-speed rail.  
 20 That project was underestimated, in terms of cost, by  
 21 approximately \$12 billion.

22 In light of this, does the Authority have a  
 23 plan for how it would deal with increases and costs?

PH-SF032-1  
 cont

PH-SF033

PH-SF033-1

24 Has the Authority worked out how cost increases will  
 25 affect the project as a whole? And if not, will the  
 0086 Authority be developing a comprehensive plan of what it  
 1 will do if the high-speed rail ends up costing much more  
 2 while failing to attract the riders necessary to support  
 3 it?  
 4

5 I will also submit a written comment.  
 6 Thank you.

7 CHAIMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much.  
 8 Excuse me. Before -- are there any other --  
 9 did I miss any of the Boalt Hall --

10 PROFESSOR INFELISE: No. And thank you very  
 11 much for your hospitality.

12 CHAIMAN PETRILLO: And thank you for your  
 13 comments. I'm sure it has made the -- our environmental  
 14 impact report better.

15 MR. DIRIDON: I'd like to thank you also and  
 16 note that if you really love the project, I'd sure hate  
 17 it if you hate it.

18 CHAIMAN PETRILLO: After Lionel Gambill,  
 19 Mr. Jason Kibbey.

20 MR. GAMBILL: Chairman Petrillo, members of  
 21 the Authority, my name is Lionel Gambill. I live in  
 22 Santa Rosa. I'm a real activist. I love trains. I've  
 23 been riding them all my life. I'll ride any train  
 24 that's there. And I totally support what this Authority  
 25 is doing. I have some quibbles, and I'll get to those.

0087 There is a lot of misinformation out there  
 1 about supposed cost overruns, and this is scurrilous  
 2 stuff. You can find the truth if you go to American  
 3 Public Transit Association. They have rebutted all of  
 4 these studies that are badmouthing rail.  
 5 Rail is sustainable; highways are not  
 6 sustainable. Airplanes can only fly if they have  
 7 petroleum. We need to move to a post-petroleum world  
 8 and soon. That's a whole other subject that I won't go  
 9 into now because I don't have the time.

10 In terms of cost for high-speed rails, rail  
 11 systems, look at TGV. They started their first line  
 12 with a 20-year bond. They retired it in nine years.  
 13 They have consistently returned a 33 percent net profit.

14 I totally support what you're doing, although  
 15 I do want to raise a couple of issues here.

16 I heard from several people that there's  
 17 tremendous pressure to revisit Altamont. And I kept  
 18 wondering are they talking about me? I finally -- I  
 19 guess there are at least three of us. And I think  
 20 compared to the other alternatives -- I want to back up  
 21 a little.

22 Early on in this process I came to an HSR  
 23 hearing here in San Francisco. And one issue that was  
 24 raised was the time and distance involved in traveling  
 25

0088 from San Francisco to Sacramento on the Los Banos  
 1 bullet. And I can't believe that they -- you're not  
 2

PH-SF033-1  
 cont

PH-SF034

PH-SF034-1

PH-SF034-2

3 looking at Altamont, and you're looking at a route that  
4 will go way down to Los Banos for anyone going back up  
5 to Sacramento. I think definitely that needs to be  
6 looked at.

PH-SF034-2  
cont

7 As far as the bridge across the bay, there  
8 will be a bridge. That was in RM-2. There will be a  
9 bridge for commuter rail. There's no reason that  
10 couldn't also support high-speed rail.

11 Certainly every -- every terminus should be in  
12 a city center. Now, maybe your maps have changed. The  
13 maps that I received from you showed one San Diego  
14 alignment terminating in Qualcomm Park. That's not  
15 downtown. You would be asking people to get off the --  
16 their high-speed train with all their baggage and  
17 transfer to a street car to get to the center of  
18 San Diego.

PH-SF034-3

19 There are several other issues were raised.  
20 I'm glad that the Authority dropped the Mangla concept a  
21 long time ago. There isn't anything Mangla can do that  
22 steel wheels on steel rails can't do. Cheaper, better,  
23 and at least as fast.

PH-SF034-4

24 CHAIMAN PETRILLO: Excuse me. You're running  
25 over. So if you can sum it up and give us your written

0089

1 comments.

2 MR. GAMBILL: My parting comment is please  
3 tell the folks at SFO forget about lengthening those  
4 runways.

PH-SF034-5

PH-SF035

5 CHAIMAN PETRILLO: Thank you.

6 Jason Kibbey, followed by Bert Crane.

7 MR. KIBBEY: Hi there, Chairman Petrillo.

8 Thank you for giving me the chance to address the  
9 committee.

10 My name is Jason Kibbey, and I'm the director  
11 of Defense of Place. We are a nonprofit organization  
12 dedicated to assuring that our protected lands stay  
13 protected in perpetuity. And I'm here to talk about my  
14 concerns with the EIR/EIS statement as it relates to  
15 parks, open space, and other protected lands.

16 I think my first comment is that I'm really  
17 disappointed that I can't come up here and give you a  
18 list of parks that I know are going to be impacted.  
19 While the EIR did manage to count the number of parks  
20 and give an estimate of 55 to 85 that would be impacted  
21 by the high-speed rail, it did not actually list any of  
22 those. I find that quite disappointing. And I think  
23 that it is inappropriate to ask Californians who in the  
24 last several years have had quite a strong history of  
25 voting for bond initiatives for parks and open space to

PH-SF035-1

0090

1 vote on another bond without knowing which parks and  
2 open space they're going to lose.

3 Another area that I would like to comment on  
4 is wilderness. We've heard from one member of the  
5 Sierra Club, a wilderness lover, about his concerns  
6 about losing it. I'm also concerned more with the  
7 spirit of not actually following the Wilderness Act of

8 California. The Orestimba wilderness in Henry Coe State  
9 Park does constitute a fairly substantial part of our  
10 stable areas, and the EIR does not really make an  
11 adequate mention of the fact that this -- the high-speed  
12 rail will be violating the Wilderness Act and would  
13 require a law change.

14 I also was happy to see in the EIR that  
15 mitigation for areas such as Don Edwards or Henry Coe  
16 State Park would be listed as something that would be  
17 virtually impossible to do and would be impossible to  
18 mitigate the lost wetlands in the San Francisco bay or  
19 some of the precious wilderness in Orestimba.

20 I believe that losing 55 to 85 parks to one  
21 project is quite significant. And I did note that the  
22 modal alternative in the EIR indicates that more would  
23 be lost through the other options in that modal  
24 alternative. But there's very little, if not nothing,  
25 to indicate exactly how that would come to be. And so I

0091

1 know for a fact if you are going to go through with  
2 this, that there will be 55 to 85 parks lost; whereas,  
3 with the modal alternatives I'm not sure how many of  
4 those actually would disappear.

5 And in conclusion, I think as a state we  
6 really should be expanding and/or increasing our  
7 protected open space and not losing them. And I don't  
8 think that we can mitigate away some of the losses that  
9 this would cause. I hope that this Authority and all of  
10 its environmental consultants are taking every possible  
11 step to assure that parks, open space, and wildlife  
12 refuges are the very last things considered.

13 Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Just one comment. We're  
15 required by law to look at the least environmentally  
16 damaging alternative. And that's why we try to do these  
17 evaluations between the different methods of use.  
18 Because fortunately or unfortunately, the increase in  
19 population over the next decade, two decades are going  
20 to be huge in California, and there's going to be  
21 impacts. And I think one of the things we're trying to  
22 do is to see which mode of transportation will serve  
23 those -- that population better and which mode of  
24 transportation will have the least environmental impact.

25 We appreciate your comments and anything that

0092

1 you can give us that is even more specific so that we  
2 can provide that will be helpful.

3 MR. DIRIDON: Mr. Chairman, I'd also like to  
4 note that although I appreciate your concern -- in fact,  
5 I really respect it -- we should remember to use the  
6 word "could" instead of "would" because we haven't  
7 chosen the alternatives. We don't know where the route  
8 is going to be yet. So we don't know how many parks are  
9 going to be affected. And also, it's -- it would be  
10 rare a park will be destroyed. There will be impact,  
11 but impact doesn't mean the park is going to be  
12 destroyed.

PH-SF035-1  
cont

PH-SF036

13 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Bert Crane, followed by  
14 Mikhail Davis.

15 MR. CRANE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members  
16 of the board.

17 I'm pleased to support the draft program  
18 EIR/EIS and the analysis and studies that have  
19 identified high-speed trains as the preferred system  
20 alternative to address the future transportation needs  
21 of California.

22 Our committee will have specific detailed  
23 response on a separate sheet in regard to the EIR and  
24 EIS. I'm here to provide general support.

25 I'd like to take this time to recommend Castle

0093

1 Airport Aviation and Redevelopment Center as the  
2 maintenance facility for the high-speed rail system.  
3 The Castle facility brings many advantages to the table  
4 that other facilities do not. Since the Castle Airport  
5 Aviation and Redevelopment Center is an active, staffed  
6 base, it already has power, access for rail, roads, and  
7 easements in place. The Castle facility has the  
8 infrastructure available to land all types of aircraft  
9 be it freight, commercial, or passenger planes.

10 I'm involved in a farming operation in central  
11 California. Having the ability to move much-needed farm  
12 and ranch parts from vendors throughout the state would  
13 be a great plus to the farming community. Often by  
14 driving to parts depots within the same day is the only  
15 option during crucial times of the year to keep our  
16 operation running. I've driven as far as Chico and back  
17 to Merced in the same day to keep things going during  
18 critical times of the year.

19 High-speed rail would enable the ag industry  
20 to move freight within the same day. This coupled with  
21 the Castle Airport Aviation and Development Center, an  
22 international airport, would allow to consumers to have  
23 access to services never thought of before.

24 Thank you for your time.

25 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much for

0094

1 coming all this way to speak to us.

2 Mikhail Davis, followed by Norman Rolfe.

PH-SF037

3 MR. DAVIS: My name is Mikhail Davis. I'm  
4 from the Earth Highland Institute.

5 I've also submitted written comments. The  
6 gist of the written comments I will -- will go over here  
7 is that I really feel like you have -- I don't know what  
8 word to use -- but you have undercut the spirit and  
9 intent and -- perhaps we'll find out -- the legal  
10 requirements of CEQA and NEPA by not considering the  
11 full range of alternatives. I really think it's  
12 telling, if you look at that map right there, that if  
13 you look at northern California, there are no  
14 alternatives for how you get to San Francisco. And I  
15 think that if you look at this map, they've shown you  
16 one alternative that goes through the more northern  
17 route and passes through Henry Coe State Park and the

PH-SF036-1

PH-SF036-2

PH-SF036-3

PH-SF037-1

18 wilderness area. And it's also -- I mean, this is a  
 19 statewide project. It's going to be difficult. You're  
 20 not going to be able to please everyone. But I think  
 21 it's telling that you see that there have been attempts  
 22 to bring in to this dialogue other areas. Look, you've  
 23 got alternatives. You have, you know, an attempt to  
 24 print an alternative that pleases the people out in  
 25 Lancaster and Palmdale, an attempt to please the people  
 0095

1 of eastern San Jose County. There has not been any  
 2 attempt to really look at what are the interests of  
 3 northern San Joaquin Valley, Merced, Modesto, all these  
 4 places that will be bypassed.

5 And the East Bay -- and I think it's  
 6 interesting that Oakland is very supportive of this.  
 7 Because they are going to have a mighty hard time  
 8 getting Stage 2 -- getting high-speed rail to Oakland --  
 9 if we don't turn a profit. So the rest of the people  
 10 who are talking about how wonderful this is, we may not  
 11 get to State 2 if this doesn't turn a profit. That's  
 12 going to be years down the road. That's why I think we  
 13 need to build Stage 1 right. Consider the Altamont.  
 14 Consider that maybe we need to build stage one that gets  
 15 us almost all the way to Sacramento going through  
 16 Altamont. Maybe we need to include those communities of  
 17 the East Bay. So let's do Stage 1 right and consider  
 18 the full range of alternatives as required in the NEPA  
 19 and CEQA process.

20 The other thing I'll just point out is that  
 21 people who have ridden the TGV in France were there  
 22 most likely as tourists. Some of us were there to  
 23 simply look at the TGV, but we're missing some of the  
 24 biggest -- we're missing Yosemite. If you loop and cut  
 25 that far south, you miss Yosemite in favor of Los Banos,  
 0096

1 which is a delight for sprawl-lovers everywhere.  
 2 There's nothing in Los Banos, especially where you've  
 3 sited the station. It's not even in Los Banos. It's  
 4 not even in Pea Soup Anderson's. It's out in the field.  
 5 I don't see how that can be nonsprawl-inducing.

6 So there's just some things that don't make  
 7 sense to me: Cut out Yosemite and include Los Banos;  
 8 create sprawl for a system that I really believe is a  
 9 great thing for California and its environment because  
 10 of its ability to cut back on sprawl and air pollution.

11 So I really -- I think that this is going to  
 12 require a further look at this. I know there's been  
 13 some study of it, but that needs to be part of the whole  
 14 public record. You can't study one thing separately and  
 15 then study everything else through the public process.  
 16 That's not the way it works. And I think that you will  
 17 find that out soon enough.

18 Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much.

20 I do want to point out one thing: We did have  
 21 extensive public hearings on all the alternatives in  
 22 northern California during the scoping process. And we

PH-SF037-1  
 cont

PH-SF037-2

23 have put in the results of the scoping process in the  
 24 Environmental Impact Report just so that you can give us  
 25 some specific comments on what we may or may not have  
 0097

1 done wrong in or scoping analysis.

PH-SF038

2 Norman Rolfe, followed by Michael Kiesung.  
 3 MR. ROLFE: Good evening. I am Norman Rolfe,  
 4 and I'm the transportation chair of San Francisco  
 5 Tomorrow and do hope to mention the DKC resolution. And  
 6 I do hope to submit some written comments in more  
 7 detail.

8 A couple of things. As I noticed in one of  
 9 these handouts that you have here in the Bay  
 10 Area-to-Central Valley sheet, it says, "Downtown  
 11 San Francisco terminus: Transbay terminal or Fourth and  
 12 King." I must point out that SBA 1856, the High-Speed  
 13 Rail Bond Act specifically states that the first line  
 14 shall run from the Transbay terminal in San Francisco to  
 15 Union Station in Los Angeles. There is a good reason  
 16 for this. Most people travelling from southern  
 17 California to northern California will indeed be going  
 18 to downtown San Francisco. The financial district, the  
 19 major hotels are all a short distance from that  
 20 terminal.

21 And I must also point out that the final  
 22 EIR/EIS for the Caltrain downtown extension in Transbay  
 23 terminal rebuilding have been released. The writers of  
 24 this document have actually done some of your work for  
 25 you. The -- these projects are designed to accommodate  
 0098

1 high-speed rail in the future. And they are, in effect,  
 2 the project EIR for one little small piece of your big  
 3 project. And, also, the EIR for the Caltrain  
 4 electrification has been released -- that's the draft  
 5 EIR -- and it undoubtedly contains information that you  
 6 can use. So, once again, they've done some of your work  
 7 for you. So please talk to the Caltrain Joint Powers  
 8 Board staff and coordinate your work with them so that  
 9 you can make use of what they've already done, and vice  
 10 versa.

11 The modal alternative as described has  
 12 unacceptable environmental impacts. The additional  
 13 freeway lanes would take too much land and destroy so  
 14 much development -- so much already developed housing,  
 15 commercial, and so forth -- that the famous or infamous  
 16 San Francisco freeway fights -- depending on how you  
 17 look at them -- would look pretty tame by comparison.

18 And, also, the airport expansion will be  
 19 required. Well, for those of you who are familiar with  
 20 Bay Area activities and who have just recently witnessed  
 21 what happened when they proposed to use San Francisco  
 22 bay to expand San Francisco Airport, that's a small  
 23 sample of what's going to be in store for whoever  
 24 advocates further airport expansion at other airports.

25 Now, the high-speed rail has a great  
 0099

1 potential. And that's what it should be doing, is to

PH-SF038-1

PH-SF038-2

2 replace most puddle-jumper flights and most of the  
3 Los Angeles-to-San Francisco shuttle flights. So that  
4 would obviate a lot of the need for airport expansion.  
5 And the no project alternative is also an expansible,  
6 adds further detrimental environmental impacts if you  
7 just don't do anything and sit still.

8 And as I said, I hope to submit more detail  
9 and comments before the deadline.

10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much for  
12 your comments.

13 Michael Kiesung, followed by Dan Oneal.

14 MR. DIRIDON: While Michael's coming forward,  
15 I'd like to note that we started studying the Transbay  
16 terminal revitalization in 1973 with Peninsula  
17 Transportation Alternative project back when Norman  
18 Rolfe's hair was brown.

19 MR. ROLFE: It was black.

20 MR. KIESLING: Michael Kiesling.

21 A little bit of realism here. Tomorrow  
22 morning I actually have to fly to LA. I'm getting up at  
23 7:30 in the morning. I'm going to get my coffee, and  
24 I'm going to walk down to the BART station, take BART to  
25 the airport for a 10:00 a.m. flight. I will probably be

0100

1 on the curb at LAX at 11:30. I would prefer if the  
2 high-speed system had been built or ready because then I  
3 would get my coffee -- I would get up, leave my  
4 apartment at 7:30, get my coffee, walk to the Transbay  
5 terminal, get on an 8:30 train and be at LA Union  
6 Station at 11:00 o'clock in the morning. Half an hour,  
7 going to LA Union Station, not even counting saving half  
8 an hour from when I would have arrived at LAX. Not  
9 counting the time -- my final destination is downtown  
10 LA -- the time it will take to get from LAX to LA Union  
11 Station.

12 In your EIR you have a question whether the  
13 station in San Francisco should be at the Transbay  
14 terminal or at Fourth and Townsend. In your documents  
15 you have your estimated costs for a Fourth and Townsend  
16 station for high-speed rail at \$438 million. And  
17 there's a little asterisk because it excludes real  
18 estate, environmental mitigation, engineering,  
19 construction management, and contingencies. So the  
20 guess might be that instead of 438 it's going to be a  
21 little bit more. The assumed share of bringing -- of  
22 bringing high-speed rail to the Transbay terminal in the  
23 Transbay terminal's Environmental Impact Report is  
24 \$475 million.

25 If you look at all these things and you take a

0101

1 realistic look at the real estate mitigation and  
2 engineering and contingencies for your Fourth and  
3 Townsend station, which you'd be building on your own,  
4 Transbay terminal is cheaper. Of course in the EIR you  
5 have to look at this as if you were building the whole  
6 Transbay terminal all by yourself for no other reason.

PH-SF038-2  
cont

PH-SF039

PH-SF039-1

PH-SF039-2

7 But as we already know, San Francisco voters have  
8 committed over \$25 billion in sales tax, there's  
9 \$150 million from Regional Measure 1, and on and on and  
10 on. So your amount is actually a better deal than  
11 staying at Fourth and Townsend where you would be  
12 further from downtown.

13 Getting back to what everybody knows is my  
14 favorite issue: Altamont. In your ridership studies,  
15 it's hard to really parse things out, and it's probably  
16 impossible to get a straight answer without re-running  
17 the models with the difference assumptions.

18 What we do know is the stations north of  
19 San Jose, if there are two terminals in the Bay Area --  
20 one in San Jose and one at the Transbay terminal in  
21 San Francisco -- about two-thirds of your final  
22 destination of the Bay Area is toward the peninsula,  
23 another third to San Jose. But what you do is, when you  
24 split -- when you make the assumption that you're  
25 splitting the trains either 50-50 to go to a terminal in  
0102

1 San Jose and a terminal in San Francisco -- or by  
2 thirds -- without paying attention to the actual  
3 destination of where people want to go, you decimate the  
4 ridership.

5 Without -- you've tested in the -- in the  
6 ridership modeling by Charles Rivers Associates what the  
7 best rate of return is for the pricing of the tickets,  
8 but you don't do a sort of equal modeling saying how do  
9 we get the most ridership assuming these different  
10 network configurations. If you have a terminal in  
11 Oakland, in San Francisco, and San Jose, run the model  
12 that says how do we get the most riders. Because if you  
13 look at your own documents, the capital costs for  
14 Altamont is less. The operating and maintenance, which  
15 is directly related to the length -- the track mile both  
16 for the miles of tracks and for the trains running back  
17 and forth is less. But then when you do the ridership  
18 and you chop all the ridership in half, you have almost  
19 a one-to-one relationship between ridership and revenue.  
20 So if the train only comes every two hours, you get  
21 about half the riders.

22 This is just observations, though, because you  
23 can't do this without re-running the model, or, if  
24 you're just a person like me, drawing everything that  
25 you can from the different documents that you have out  
0103

1 there.

2 So it would be nice to honestly state what's  
3 going on with ridership and make assumptions about where  
4 people want to go in the amount of service that's given  
5 to every place on the system rather than just saying  
6 we're going to chop the system in half or in thirds and  
7 provide ridership that way. Because it really does  
8 decimate a true look at how you're getting your  
9 ridership numbers. So once again, you need to study  
10 Altamont. Transbay terminal is a great, great, great  
11 place for train stations. Somebody's going to pay for

PH-SF039-2  
cont

PH-SF039-3

12 almost all of it for you. You have just a little drop  
 13 in the hat. And I wish I was taking the train to LA  
 14 tomorrow.

15 Thanks.

16 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Dan Oneal, followed by Nia  
 17 Crowder.

PH-SF040

18 MR. ONEAL: Mr. Chairman, members of the  
 19 board. My name is Dan Oneal. I am one of a partnership  
 20 that owns approximately 11,000 acres on the northern  
 21 Diablo route. I wanted to protest your going in that  
 22 direction based on the EIR/EIS report and some of the  
 23 maps that I've seen. And being familiar with the  
 24 ground, I have a pretty good idea of exactly where the  
 25 line would be going.

0104

1 First of all, it would interfere with one of  
 2 the major elk herds in the state of California which are  
 3 on our property and graze there on a regular basis, in  
 4 addition to 20 or 30 antelope that are on the property.  
 5 We are in the flight line of ducks and geese and  
 6 migratory birds traveling from the bay through -- to  
 7 Los Banos in the areas down there.

8 In 1956, we had an archeology class come on  
 9 the ranch, and they excavated an Indian village which is  
 10 probably about a mile from where the proposed line would  
 11 go. At the time the professors told us that there was  
 12 a -- another large village and burial ground just about  
 13 where the line is traveling. And there are Indian  
 14 artifacts in bedrock mortars all over the ranch. So I'm  
 15 not exactly sure how much of that would be impacted.

16 We have probably 160, 170 species of bird on  
 17 the place, including bald eagles, which I'm told are  
 18 there this year -- I haven't seen them personally, but  
 19 I've seen them there in the past -- together with golden  
 20 eagles.

21 In addition, there is a huge spring and  
 22 aquifer about a mile to the south of where the line  
 23 would go, which drains ultimately into Calaveras  
 24 Reservoir and the City of San Francisco. Now, we do  
 25 have the water rights so far as they go through us, but

0105

1 water is traveling in that Isabel Creek all year-round,  
 2 not on the surface but certainly under the surface. I  
 3 think that's -- we have water all over the place. And  
 4 I'm sure that that's going to impound any tunneling that  
 5 may be done because the water comes out of the hills at  
 6 approximately 4,000 feet with running springs. There is  
 7 no rain in this area from May. And that water is  
 8 running in September. So it's there. It's coming under  
 9 an aquifer under the state of California, I believe,  
 10 from the Sierras, the only way it can get there. And  
 11 those aquifers are going to be affected by any tunneling  
 12 that's done in the area.

13 I just wanted to make those -- that  
 14 information known to you. And I appreciate it if you  
 15 would consider that.

16 Thank you.

PH-SF039-3  
 cont

PH-SF040-1